

The compliments of the President and
Trustees of Dartmouth College.



Daniel Webster

**The Proceedings of
THE WEBSTER
CENTENNIAL *o o*
The Commemoration
by Dartmouth College
of the Services of
DANIEL WEBSTER
to the College and the
State *o o* Held upon
the occasion of *The*
One Hundredth Anni
versary of *The* Gradua
tion of Mr. Webster *o***



**Edited by Ernest Martin Hopkins
Secretary to the President *o* and
printed under the supervision of
Homer Eaton Keyes *o* Instructor
in English *o o o o o o o o***

Introduction.

WITH the approach of the year 1901 the sentiment found general expression among the alumni and friends of Dartmouth that the College ought to celebrate in some fitting manner the centennial of the graduation of Daniel Webster. At a meeting held on January 19th, 1900, the trustees passed the following vote :

“In view of the fact that the Commencement of 1901 will be the one-hundredth Anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster, whose supreme service to the College in recovering and re-establishing its chartered rights calls for grateful recognition on the part of the Sons of Dartmouth :

“Be it voted that the Centennial of Mr. Webster’s graduation be observed at Hanover, at such time in the year 1901, and in such manner, as may be appropriate, to be participated in by the faculty, students, alumni and friends of the College.”

If Mr. Webster’s only service to the College had been that of recovering and re-establishing her chartered rights, recognition would still have been called for, but it is possible that such recognition might have taken a different form from that which was given, and the anniversary have been made strictly an academic occasion. As it was, Mr. Webster’s services to the nation added such lustre to the name of Dartmouth, and his

personal fame so directly increased the fame of the College that it did not seem as feasible to acknowledge the debt due to the great statesman, the loyal alumnus, in an academic as in a civic occasion. Thus the event was unique,—the observance by a college of the anniversary of the graduation of one of her sons through a civic celebration.

The preparation for the Centennial was entrusted to two general committees, one of the trustees, consisting of the Honorable James B. Richardson, the Honorable Benjamin A. Kimball, and Doctor Cecil F. P. Bancroft, and one of the faculty, consisting of Professors Justin H. Smith, Louis H. Dow, and Frank G. Moore.

The committee of the trustees made the arrangement for the speakers at the different exercises, and issued the invitations bearing the fac-simile of the autograph of Mr. Webster, but the chief burden of preparation fell upon the local committee. Sub-committees were appointed from the faculty to take charge of the details incident to the celebration—the design of the program and the oversight of the printing, the decoration of the grounds and the buildings, the electrical display, the athletic events, the equipment of the torch-light procession, and the entertainment of guests, visitors and alumni. The co-operation of the students was invaluable. Special recognition is due Colonel Charles K. Darling for his services as Marshal throughout the exercises.

The completion of College Hall gave the requisite facilities for the social observance of the occasion. The club rooms of the building proved to be exactly fitted for the reception of guests and the uses of the various committees; the dormitory section added greatly to the con-

venience of entertaining guests, and the large and stately dining hall, hung with portraits of Mr. Webster, and of many of the alumni and benefactors of the College, furnished a most appropriate setting for the brilliant assemblage gathered at the banquet.

With the exception of one or two of the earlier classes, every class from 1841 was represented. Judge Cross, of the class of 1841 was the oldest, and by no means the least active, of the graduates present. There were present from the class of 1851, attending the exercises and observing their fiftieth anniversary, Samuel H. Folsom, Esq., Mr. Gilbert E. Hood, Enoch G. Hooke, Esq., Senator Redfield Proctor, Mr. Daniel Putnam, Chief Justice Jonathan Ross, and Professor Henry E. Sawyer.

The occasion was made memorable by the presence of many guests of personal and official distinction who came to do honor to the memory of Mr. Webster. The tribute which was paid by their presence and their words, representing so great a variety of political opinions, may be assumed to express the general estimation in which the services of Mr. Webster are held after the lapse of one hundred years from the beginning and forty-nine years from the close of his career.

The enjoyment of the occasion was greatly enhanced by the weather, unusual even in the rich and mellow days of September, which not only made the carrying out of the whole program possible, but also gave exhilaration to each event.

**Program of The
W E B S T E R
CENTENNIAL of
Dartmouth College
Celebrating the
One Hundredth
Anniversary of
The Graduation
of DANIEL
WEBSTER**



**September 24th & 25th, 1901
Hanover New Hampshire**

TUESDAY

September 24th

2.30 O'CLOCK

The faculty and students will assemble in the College Yard to form in procession * * *

3 O'CLOCK

EXERCISES IN THE COLLEGE CHURCH * * *

Organ Prelude

Chorus

Prayer by the Reverend Samuel Penniman
Leeds, D. D.

Chorus

Address by Professor Charles Francis Richardson, Ph. D., '71

Mr. Webster's College Life

Address by Professor John King Lord,
Ph. D., '68

The Development of the College Since
the Dartmouth College Case

Chorus

The Choral music during the week of the Webster Centennial will be rendered by students under the direction of Professor Charles Henry Morse, Mus. Bac. * * * * *

* * *

5 O'CLOCK

A short game of foot ball will be played on Alumni Oval by the 'Varsity Eleven and an Alumni Eleven * * * * *

TUESDAY ♡ ♡ ♡ ♡ September 24th

8 O'CLOCK ♡

"DARTMOUTH NIGHT"



In view of the occasion, Dartmouth Night will take the form of an out-door celebration, which will open with a torchlight parade, in costume, led by the College band and commanded by Colonel Charles Kimball Darling, '85. The faculty will wear black academic gowns and mortar-board caps; the students, a similar dress, except that each class will be distinguished by a particular color—white for the Seniors, blue for the Juniors, scarlet for the Sophomores, and yellow for the Freshmen. Members of the graduate departments will wear the same costume in still different colors. The alumni will appear in a Webster costume of blue coat, buff waistcoat, stock, dicky and tall hat. A feature of the parade will be a number of transparencies together with several floats, among which will be Webster's carriage and his huge plough ♡ ♡ ♡ ♡ ♡ After completing its line of march, the procession will assemble in the College Yard, where there will be brief speeches, music by the Glee Club and the exhibition of a series of stereopticon views illustrating Webster's life and career. Immediately following, the campus will be illuminated with electric lights, fireworks and a bonfire. A number of prize athletic contests will be held, the evening closing with the singing of Dartmouth songs by the entire assemblage ♡ ♡ ♡ ♡ ♡

WEDNESDAY

September 25th

9.30 O'CLOCK

ASSEMBLAGE IN COLLEGE YARD










A procession made up of students, alumni, faculty, trustees and invited guests will form in the College Yard in charge of the Marshal, Colonel Charles Kimball Darling, '85  

10 O'CLOCK

EXERCISES IN THE COLLEGE CHURCH

Processional "Priest's March from
Athalie" Mendelssohn

Chorus "Sanctus in E flat" Osgood

Prayer by the Reverend Alvah Hovey, D. D.,
'44, Ex-President Newton Theological
Seminary         

Chorus "Prayer of Thanksgiving"
Old Netherlands (1626)

Address by the President of the College

Oration by the Honorable Samuel Walker
McCall, '74, of Massachusetts   

Chorus "Ein Feste Burg" Old German

Conferring of Honorary Degrees

The singing by chorus and congregation of
Milton's paraphrase of Psalm cxxxvi

Benediction

WEDNESDAY

September 25th

PSALM cxxxi

Let us with a gladsome mind
Praise the Lord, for He is kind ;
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

Let us blaze His name abroad,
For of Gods He is the God ;
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

He with all-commanding might
Filled the new-made world with light ;
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

He His chosen race did bless
In the wasteful wilderness ;
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

All things living He doth feed,
His full hand supplies their need ;
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

Let us therefore chorus forth
His high majesty and worth ;
For His mercies aye endure,
Ever faithful, ever sure.

Amen.

WEDNESDAY

September 25th

2.30 O'CLOCK

CEREMONIES ATTENDING THE
LAYING OF THE CORNER-STONE
OF WEBSTER HALL * * *

The corner-stone will be laid by Samuel Appleton, Esq., the only living grandson of Daniel Webster * * * * *

The prayer of dedication will be offered by the Right Reverend Abiel Leonard, D.D., '70, Bishop of Utah * * * * *

Address by the Honorable Frank Swett Black, '75, Ex-Governor of New York

Selections of Music will be rendered by a chorus of students * * * * *

4 O'CLOCK

EXERCISES IN THE OLD CHAPEL *

Reminiscences of Mr. Webster by some of the Older Graduates and Guests

6.30 O'CLOCK











Out-of-door Concert by the Salem Cadet Band

WEDNESDAY





September 25th







7 O'CLOCK 





BANQUET IN COLLEGE HALL





On occasion of this, the first public use of the Dining Hall, the walls will be hung with portraits of Mr. Webster in possession of the College          


The Honorable Alfred Russell, LL. D., '50, will preside          






Responses will be made by the President of the College, and by His Excellency the Governor of New Hampshire    

Chief-Justice Isaac Newton Blodgett, LL. D., of the Supreme Court of the State, will speak on Mr. Webster's training at the New Hampshire Bar  The Honorable Frank Palmer Goulding, '63, will speak on Mr. Webster at the Massachusetts Bar     

Some aspects of Mr. Webster's personal life and associations will be given by Edwin Webster Sanborn, Esquire, '78, the Honorable George Fred Williams, '72, and the Reverend Edward Everett Hale, D. D.    

Professor Francis Brown, LL. D., '70, will speak on the relation of President Brown to the Dartmouth College Case    

The Honorable George Frisbie Hoar, LL. D., will speak on Mr. Webster in the Senate 

Chief-Justice Melville Weston Fuller, LL. D., (it is expected) will speak of Mr. Webster before the Supreme Court     

"I would have an inscription over the door of your building, 'Founded by Eleazar Wheelock, Refounded by Daniel Webster.'" —Joseph Hopkinson, Esq., to President Francis Brown, after the decision of the Supreme Court of United States in the "Dartmouth College Case."



This program was designed, put into type and printed at the office of The Dartmouth Press, Hanover, New Hampshire. ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧ ❧

Program.

The opening exercises of the Centennial were held at an early hour on Tuesday afternoon, anticipating the arrival of many of the alumni and guests. The trustees, faculty, and students assembled at 1.30 o'clock in the College Yard, and marched in procession to the College Church.

Organ Prelude—Festival March. *Smart*

Professor Charles Henry Morse, Mus. Bac.

Chorus—Lift up your Heads, Ye Gates. *Luetzel*

Prayer by the Reverend Samuel Penniman Leeds, D. D.

Address by Professor Charles Francis Richardson, Ph. D., '71.

Mr. Webster's College Life.

Address by Professor John King Lord, Ph. D., '68.

The Development of the College Since the
Dartmouth College Case.

Chorus—Integer Vitae. *Fleming*

Mr. Webster's College Life.

Address by Professor Charles Francis Richardson, Ph. D., '71.

NE hundred years ago last winter, at eight o'clock on Wednesday evening, the thirty-first of December, a lad of nineteen sat in his college room, probably in old Dartmouth, which he jocosely called Beechnut Hall, and wrote to his friend Bingham: "Tomorrow, Hervey, is the first day of the year, and of the century, which none of us will probably live to see closed."

Ten decades have rolled around, and we meet in the first year of another century to celebrate, for the first time in the history of American colleges, the graduation of

him whom most we delight to honor at Dartmouth, whose "great stone face" is carved as that of the chief orator of the new world on the walls of the academic theatre of our oldest university ; and whose name was but lately selected as entitled to rank with those of Washington and Lincoln at the very top of the roll of fame of the nation, as preserved in the stately hall of learning between the Hudson and the sea. Not alone in Dartmouth, therefore, is advanced the claim that Webster in some respects stands supreme among the alumni of the colleges of the United States. It is my modest office, in chronological preparation for the more important addresses that are to follow, to try to bring before you some little picture of Webster's four years in what the poet of "Snow-Bound" called "classic Dartmouth's college halls."

The student of history soon discovers how infrequent is the examination of original documents and how common the re-phrasing of familiar statements. There is, in the accounts of Webster's college days, as set forth by his several biographers, a striking similarity of idea and even of word. With minor garnishments of rhetoric, we are told, at greater or less length, that his undergraduate life was industrious ; that he read more than he studied, making, like Shakespeare, greater progress in Latin than Greek ; that he excelled in history, oratory, and English acquirements ; and that he once superintended a "little weekly newspaper." We recognize the slippery phrase "it can easily be believed," in its changing forms of expression ; and at last we are ready to declare the swollen story, as Dr. Ordronaux said of the orations of a living Boanerges of New York politics,

a "monstrous compound of tautology, redundancy, verbosity and pleonasm."

Even the chapter in Mr. George Ticknor Curtis' indispensable biography is wordy ; three pages are devoted to the statement that truth, not exaggeration, should be sought in accounts of a great man's youth, and elsewhere there is much that is fanciful, superfluous, or irrelevant. I do not propose, in the short time before me, to weary you with iterations so easily to be found on the printed page. The later writers have, according to the fashion of our time, been the more conservative ; but the authorities of chief value, among the many I have diligently examined, are the records of the trustees, the Phi Beta Kappa, and the United Fraternity ; Webster's autobiographical notes ; the letters of himself and his college friends, especially those gathered by Professor Sanborn when preparing the eulogy delivered at Phillips Academy in 1853, and later used in several articles by the same hand, on Daniel Webster as a Student ; the reminiscences of Judge Samuel Swift of the class of 1800 ; the *Dartmouth Gazette* and reprints therefrom ; Webster's two undergraduate orations now in print ; and Professor Colby's thorough account of the evolution of the Dartmouth curriculum in political science and related subjects.

If we begin with a glance at externals, the academic buildings which Webster beheld during his college quadrennium are brought back to the mind's eye by the water-color sketch made by George Ticknor in 1803, at the age of eleven. This sketch, now one of our most valued memorabilia, represents Dartmouth Hall in its present external appearance ; southwest, substantially on the

site of Reed Hall, stands the president's house, long since moved across the common, and lately restored as the Howe Library; in front of the present location of Thornton Hall, and near the street, stands the old chapel, removed in 1828 to the neighborhood of Hubbard House and afterwards pulled to the other side of Main Street and transformed into—perhaps I should merely say for the first time called—a barn; while northeast and northwest of Dartmouth Hall, respectively, are the house of Ebenezer Woodward, the site of which is now shown by an abandoned well, and a long two-story wooden structure, which served for divers academic and culinary purposes, near the present chapel site.

As regards the location of Webster's college rooms, I have spent as much time as that devoted to the entire remainder of my address in trying to reduce the misty stories of a century to something like fact. In Freshman and Sophomore years, 1797-99, he roomed in the house of Humphrey Farrar, with Farrar's son George, class of 1800, and William, class of 1801, and Freeborn Adams, non-graduate. This is the written testimony of George Farrar.* In 1788 Humphrey Farrar had bought of President Wheelock a lot "with a large house and a shop standing thereon," somewhat southeast of the present corner of Main and Lebanon Streets. In 1793 he added thereto an adjoining lot lying north of the lot and home "owned and occupied" by him, this new purchase being the corner at present owned by Mr. E. P. Storrs. As the record of this purchase was filed Oct. 14, 1801, just prior to Farrar's sale of the whole property,

*George Farrar to Prof. E. D. Sanborn, Nov. 25, 1852.—Private Correspondence of Daniel Webster, I: 53.

the inference is clear that Webster roomed in a house situated thereon, during Freshman and Sophomore years. For this interesting discovery I am indebted to the painstaking search made for me by George H. Kendall, Esq., Register of Deeds of Grafton County. It is probable that the fabric of this Farrar house survives, at least in part, as the existing Wainwright house. For Webster's abode in Junior and Senior years three localities are named, none of which can be reduced to accurate time-limits. The late Miss Lucy J. McMurphy was told by William Dewey, about 1850, that to his knowledge Webster roomed in the McMurphy house, time not specified; and she wrote in 1896 that she thought Dewey said that Webster occupied the south chamber.* In Junior year he continued to room with Freeborn Adams, and for the greater part of some one year he roomed with Aaron Loveland of his own class. Judge Loveland's nephew, Mr. Charles Ensworth, now living in Norwich, thinks they roomed in the house of the father of the William Dewey already named, who, after Webster's college days, built the present home of Mrs. Frederick Chase, but had, perhaps, previously occupied another house on the same site. In Senior year, according to tradition, and the oral statement made to Dean Emerson by Professor Sanborn of the class of 1832, Webster roomed in Dartmouth Hall. A more specific tradition declares that he occupied the room then and now numbered 1, northwest corner of the third story, as was understood by my father, Moses Charles Richardson of the class of 1841, who was its occupant 1840-1, and by

*Letter filed in the College library.

Dean Emerson of the class of 1868, who was its occupant 1865-7.

Webster wrote from Washington, Feb. 5, 1849, to James H. Bingham as "my dear old class-mate, roommate, and friend," but no such expression as "room-mate" is contained in his letters to Bingham during or immediately after their college course, though the two were intimate associates. It is probable, from this allusion, from George Farrar's testimony, and from Aaron Loveland's recollection, that a somewhat loose system of *meum* and *tuum*, in the matter of rooms, was in vogue in the early and simple days of the College.

The triennial catalogues of graduates of the College began in 1786, but the first annual list of the officers and students of "Dartmouth University"—which term was habitually used by the authorities years before it became the badge of the opposing party in the great contest—was issued in October, 1802, a year after Webster's graduation. The little company of instructors—a president and three men in the College, and one in the medical school—given in the general catalogue of 1801, was the same, save as regards two tutors, with which Webster had been familiar in his student days. The extent of the wisdom of the teachers reminds one of Italian versatility in the time of Leonardo. Honorable John Wheelock, LL. D., was president and professor of civil and ecclesiastical history; Honorable Bezaleel Woodward, A. M., was professor of mathematics, natural philosophy, and ethics, and also trustee and treasurer, and judge of the county court; Rev. John Smith, A. M., was trustee and librarian and likewise professor of "Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and other oriental languages"; and

Nathan Smith, M. D., besides being teacher of the theory and practice of medicine and of anatomy and surgery, was professor of chemistry. The tutors had been John Noyes (afterwards a member of Congress for a single term) from 1797 to 1799; Stephen Bemis (later a minister in Massachusetts) from 1799 to 1800; and Roswell Shirliff, as he then spelled his name, from 1800. Wheelock, Woodward, John Smith, and the successive tutors were Webster's instructors; and it should be said of the last-named down-trodden class that their usefulness in personal contact with students, while pursuing their multifarious duties of teaching everything that the professors left untouched or did not know, was an important factor in the history of American colleges prior to 1850.

The reminiscences of some of these men by Judge Samuel Swift of Middlebury, of the class of 1800, who lived to be the oldest graduate of the college, are vivid: "President Wheelock's instructions were confined to the Senior class, and he was not regarded by them as a popular or profitable teacher. His knowledge and his instructions were mostly confined to the book. He was much of a recluse, and mingled little in public or private with the world, and seemed to know little of it. He affected a stiff dignity towards the students, and in all his movements; his walks abroad, across the common or elsewhere, with his three-cornered hat, were in slow and measured steps. The library was kept in one of the rooms of the upper story (of Dartmouth Hall), and was said, on what authority I do not know, to contain about 4,000 volumes. A considerable proportion of them were duodecimos, and other small volumes con-

tributed, I suppose, by friends who had no further use for them. The books seemed not to be selected because they were particularly appropriate for a college library. In another upper room was what was called a museum, consisting of curiosities said to be collected by former graduates and others in their travels. The most noticeable, and the only one I recollect, was a stuffed skin of a large fowl, understood to be found in South America. On one occasion the building caught fire. The flames were making decided progress, when President Wheelock, appearing in the excited crowd, called to a student to secure 'the Great Bird'. By the vigorous application of snow, however, the fire was at length subdued and the building and most of its contents rescued. John Smith, Professor of Greek and Latin—known among the students as Professor Johnny—was an amiable man, but of formal manners. He was a critical book-scholar, but an artificial teacher. He preached also on the Sabbath to the students and villagers, but with little animation or force in his composition or delivery. Bezaleel Woodward . . . was in everything the reverse of President Wheelock and Professor Smith . . . There was nothing scholastic about his appearance or manners."

The instruction proffered at Dartmouth, at the time, may have deserved the adjective "meagre", so often used by Webster's biographers, but it was at least logically progressive, and some of the teachers were strong men. It is a hasty error to assume that the curriculum of American colleges, a century ago, was not much better than that of a good high school of to-day. Latin was taught with some approach to thoroughness; quotations from classical authors were still heard from

undergraduate lips ; and mature young men got sound discipline from the philosophical, the semi-philosophical, or even the theological subjects set before them in the class-room. The College library was miserably scanty, but the English rhetoricians of the eighteenth century—headed by Addison with his poetical prose and Pope with his prosy verse—were influential upon the student because so closely connected with the Roman classicism of the daily recitation. If Webster knew less Greek than Latin, it must be remembered that everywhere in America, prior to 1800, Greek was viewed through a Latin haze and was much less competently taught.

But we naturally ask, with peculiar interest : What instruction did Webster receive in legal and political studies ? Says Professor Colby, in his account of the early curriculum at Dartmouth, aside from ancient languages, mathematics, and religious branches : “The location of the College on the frontier, and the stirring events which followed its founding, the Revolution, the framing of the new constitutions, state and federal, the long struggle over the New Hampshire grants, and the rise of American political parties, aroused liveliest interest in law and government throughout all the region where dwelt the natural constituency of the College, and made increasing demand upon it for legal and political training. Evidence of effort to satisfy this demand may be found in the first formal curriculum of the College, which was adopted by its trustees in 1796. This, under the head of ‘Public and Classical Exercises’, enumerates among the subjects of study for Juniors, ‘natural and moral philosophy’, and among those for Seniors, ‘natur-

al and politic law'. Since moral philosophy, as then defined, treated of the state—the subject-matter of political science—the first formal curriculum of the College appears to have included both the studies of law and government. Neither search in the official records of the College, nor wide gleaning among the graduates of that period, yields much information about the conduct of these courses from 1796 to 1822. Instruction in natural and politic law apparently fell, with the general care of the Senior class, to the President, and so was given to John Wheelock from 1796 to 1815 . . . The instruction in moral philosophy (including political philosophy) apparently was assigned, with the general care of the Junior class, to Rev. John Smith, Professor of the Latin and Greek languages from 1796 to 1804 . . . Probably the earliest text-books in each of these subjects were those known to have been in use in 1816. These were the two famous works, Burlamarqui's *Principles of Natural and Politic Law*, first published in Geneva in 1747 and republished in Boston as early as 1793, and Paley's *Moral and Political Philosophy*, first published in England in 1785 and republished in Boston as early as 1795. The sixth book of Paley is devoted to what is now called political science—the state, its origin, forms of government, civil liberty, and the administration of justice. Both of these books were then coming into use in America, and the former was prescribed as a text in the college as late as 1828, and the latter as late as 1838."

To the institution thus housed, officered and arranged, Webster came as a Freshman in August, 1797, having studied a little at Exeter and received his final

preparation from Rev. Samuel Wood, a graduate of 1779, for fifty-five years pastor at Boscawen. When his father first told him he was to go to college, "the very idea," he afterwards said, "thrilled my whole frame." He had quickly read the stipulated three or four orations of Cicero and four or five books of Virgil, and spent only three months over the Greek Testament. One writer says that Daniel's admission was due less to his own acquirements than to Mr. Wood's influence as a trustee, which remark does not lead us into an investigation of the potentiality of the trustees, as Mr. Wood did not belong to their honorable body. Webster reached Hanover in a stage with Junior Roswell Shurtleff, who (according to the memory of his daughter, the late Mrs. Susan Brown) showed him attention and escorted him for quarters to the house now occupied by Dr. Leeds, then, like so many country houses of the time, a sort of inn. Dr. Shurtleff, who remembered him well in his college days as thin, dark, and pale, slept in the same room with him the first night. Rumor declares that Webster passed his entrance examinations in the same house. In Freshman year he studied Latin (beginning with book VII of the Aeneid), Greek (New Testament), arithmetic and algebra. He joined the United Fraternity Nov. 7, 1797, which society met in his room Nov. 21. He was elected by it "inspector of books" Aug. 12, 1798.

In Sophomore year he is said to have delivered an oration on a deceased class-mate, and to have given a poem before the class, every line of which ended in *ion*, no very difficult metrical task. In the winter of 1797 and 1798 he taught school in his home town of Salis-

bury, the first year for four dollars a month and the second year for six. May 14, 1799, he was elected Fraternity librarian and member of the standing committee.

In Junior year and the following he wrote anonymously, or as "Icarus," for the *Dartmouth Gazette*, a general, not collegiate, weekly, published in Hanover by Moses Davis, also making selections for the paper. Davis issued the first number of this *Gazette*, which was at least the third Hanover paper, "on the College plain, west of the Meeting-House, Hanover, Newhampshire," on Aug. 27, 1799, and published it until his death in July, 1806, also issuing a small fortnightly called the *Literary Tablet*, "by Nicholas Orlando," from 1803 to 1806. Webster's contributions were pretty regular, from the initial number, for the first two years of the paper, which were the last of his college course. As far as preserved, they do not differ from the usual newspaper verse and prose of the period; the pentameters are of the *one two, three four, five six, seven eight nine ten* order; sentiment is enforced by capitalization; jocosity is rather too roomy; and the glories of peace are properly commended at the expense of the horrors of war. The cleverest of them is a scheme for a Napoleonic subjugation of the inhabitants of the moon. For his work, which Davis was always glad to get, Webster received some \$50 or \$75, enough, as he remembered, to pay a year's board in those frugal days. Davis wrote from Hanover, Nov. 26, 1802, with a jocose persistency which brooked no denial, demanding from Webster a "newsboy's message" for January, 1803. "I want," said he, "a genuinely Federal address, and you are the very man to write it," adding, "some of

our most respectable characters join in this request. It is conjectured that 'Icarus' has flocked with the wild geese and gone South for a warmer climate. It is, however, expected he will return early in the spring." This "newsboy's message," we are told, was written as his last contribution to the paper. I regret that I have failed to find it. After Davis' death the *Gazette* passed into the hands of Charles Spear, who conducted it until 1819 as a judicious Federalist organ, and during the college-university contest, as an advocate of the college party. The latest known issue is that for June 23, 1819.

To return to Webster as a college Junior: Oct. 15, 1799, the Fraternity voted to "reposit" in its annals an oration delivered by him, the manuscript of which was afterwards stolen. Nov. 26, 1799, Webster gave a voluntary oration, and Dec. 3, an assigned oration, before the Fraternity. Dec. 17, possibly on Webster's suggestion, Printer Moses Davis was elected an honorary member. May 27, 1800, Webster was chosen vice-president. Aug. 19 he was elected orator and "first critic," his place as orator preceding that of other officers, president, etc., chosen at the same time. Aug. 20, 1799, he and Joseph W. Brackett had been asked to write a "dialogue for exhibition at the next Commencement." This seems to have been presented at the end of his Junior year, in the College church, then more histrionically hospitable than now. The Fraternity had voted to give a play every year at that period, but a subsequent vote discontinued the custom after one trial; we are not told whether the reason was that the dialogue was inimitable or that it was intolerable.

Webster's membership in the Phi Beta Kappa society is made interesting by the fact that the records of four of its meetings are in his handwriting as secretary pro tem. He had been elected, June 5, 1800, and he was initiated, as the only incomer, July 3. This was glory enough for one meeting, so the society "voted to omit the exercises till next week on Thursday."

Aug. 26, 1800, Rev. Mr. Wood, his former tutor, was elected an honorary member of the Fraternity, doubtless at Webster's suggestion. Oct. 7, Ephraim Simonds gave a Fraternity oration on the Beauties of Friendship, and Webster one on Ambition. Simonds died June 18, 1801, and Webster subsequently delivered a commemorative oration on his class-mate and friend. Nov. 25, Webster was elected president of the Fraternity. On Wednesday, Aug. 27, 1801, he received his bachelor's degree.

Turning from the chronological to the general, we must never forget that in all our consideration of Webster's college course, we are concerned with the being and doing of a boy between fifteen and nineteen years, who left Dartmouth at an age about that of the "average man" of the present incoming Freshman class. On the whole, his career as an undergraduate bore some resemblance to that of Emerson and Hawthorne at other New England institutions, in that he read much, but did not seek or reach the highest academic honors. This is a common, perhaps the usual, experience of those to whom technical scholarship does not strongly appeal. As an orator he made an unusual mark, as is proved by the common testimony of his associates; by his selection as Fourth-of-July speaker before the citizens of Hanover in

1800; and by his appearance as the commemorative eulogist of his class-mate Simonds.

Says Webster himself, in his fragmentary autobiography, "Of my college life I can say but little. I was graduated, in course, in August, 1801. Owing to some difficulties, *haec non meminisse juvat*, I took no part in the Commencement exercises. I spoke an oration to the Society of the United Fraternity, which I suspect was a sufficiently boyish performance. My college life was not an idle one. Besides the regular attendance of prescribed duties and studies, I read something of English history and English literature. Perhaps my reading was too miscellaneous. I even paid my board for a year by superintending a little weekly newspaper, and making selections for it from books of literature, and from the contemporary publications. I suppose I sometimes wrote a foolish paragraph myself. While in college I delivered two or three occasional addresses, which were published. I trust they are forgotten; they were in very bad taste. I had not then learned that all true power in writing is in the idea, not in the style, an error into which the *ars rhetorica*, as it is usually taught, may easily lead stronger heads than mine."

Professor Sanborn once said to him at his own table in Franklin: "It is commonly reported . . . that you did not study much in college." He raised his eyebrows very high and replied with spirit: "What fools they must be to suppose that anybody could succeed in college or public life without study! I studied and read more than all the rest of my class, if they had all been made into one man. And I was as much above them then as I am now." This is the sort of

indignant egotism into which the really great man occasionally breaks, and we pardon him. But at another time he wrote: "My scholarship was overestimated. . . . Many other students read more than I did and knew more than I did. But so much as I read I made my own. . . . Thus greater credit was given me for extensive and accurate knowledge than I really possessed." To George Ticknor he once remarked: "My Greek and mathematics were not great while I was in college, but I was better read in history and English generally than any of my class, and I was good in composition. My Latin was pretty strong too." The year before his death he wrote: "My attainments, if I made any, were not such as told for much in the recitation room. After leaving college I 'caught up', as the boys say, pretty well in Latin; but in college, and afterward, I left Greek to Loveland and mathematics to Shattuck. Would that I had pursued my Greek till I could read and understand Demosthenes in his own language."

One writer has expressed surprise that the modern Demosthenes did not excel as a Hellenist. I would say that the Demosthenian element in Webster was furnished by his Saxon inwit and the Ciceronian by his Roman studies, did I not remember that Cicero was in some ways a more modern and facile man than Webster himself. Were Webster and Cicero to re-appear in American political life, Webster would be the mightier in discussing the question whether the Constitution follows the flag, but Cicero would be the more serviceable in finding a remedy for municipal maladministration.

One of Mr. Webster's most careful biographers thinks that he lacked "close, steady, and disinterested

attention.” It would seem, however, that his study of history, as a collegian, and his obvious correlation of Hume and Gibbon with his class-room work in Latin and practical philosophy, proved the contrary. Let us not fall into the too prevalent habit of guesswork when we aver that the known productions of Webster, in the years immediately following his graduation, are so closely connected with the academic fashions of 1801 as to suggest an inevitable relation of cause to effect. The new work of romanticism, introduced to English readers by Coleridge and Wordsworth’s “Lyrical Ballads” of 1798, was as yet unknown at Dartmouth, where Coleridge was soon to be a philosophic power; and Webster as collegian—indeed to the end of his days—was an exponent of the grandeur that was Rome rather than the glory that was Greece. A full and eloquent expansion of this fact you have read for yourselves in Choate’s resplendent eulogy, perhaps the most famous speech ever delivered from this memory-haunted platform.

“Black Dan” as a collegian—he was mistaken by one of the Hanover Deweys for an Indian entering the Moor School his first Sunday in the College church—was impressive as a mighty man in the moulding process; a potent figure, spare, with high cheek-bones, storm-tossed eyes, a resonant voice, and a dignity of carriage that was not inconsistent with the hearty humor of a certain good-fellowship. But there have come down to us no stories such as those of Hawthorne’s mild playing for stakes at Bowdoin, Poe’s heavier gambling at the University of Virginia, or Emerson’s utter incapacity for mathematics at Harvard. If Webster indulged in discreet flirtations, which are the subject of jocose allu-

sions in his letters of the time, they evidently left him, and the young women mentioned, heart-free. You will also be glad to learn that if, as one of his biographers discreetly puts it, "there was gaiety in the little town of Hanover in those days," it was, he says, "of that modest and moderate sort which consisted with the habits of learning, and of a religious community."

The testimony of his college mates, even when we make allowance for the natural tendency to magnify a great man's early virtues and to minimize his faults, is consistent. Says one of them: "I should as soon have suspected John Wheelock, the President, of improper conduct as Daniel Webster . . . He was dignified, constant, well-prepared, industrious; read with rapidity; a good general scholar; unequalled in composition and speaking; a talented debater; was accustomed to arrange his thoughts in his mind in his room or private walks, and put them upon paper just before the exercise was called for. Once a sudden flaw of wind took away his paper, and it was last seen flying over the meeting-house, but he went in and spoke its contents with remarkable fluency. He always attended public worship," a commendable trait that, with the connivance of the College authorities, has characterized the Dartmouth man ever since. Another witness avers that he was the "most remarkable young man in College; no one thought of equalling the vigor and glow of his eloquence; his habits and moral character were entirely unimpeachable." Said one of his classmates: "If anything difficult was to be done, the task was laid upon Webster." Another recalls that "the powers of his mind were remarkably displayed by the compass and force of his arguments in extemporaneous

debates at the meetings of the literary society. At that early day, the clearness of his reasonings, connected with his aspect and manner, produced an almost irresistible impression upon his hearers. His large, black, piercing eye, peering out under dark, overhanging brows; his broad, intellectual forehead; the solemn tones of his voice; the dignity of his mien, with an earnestness by which he seemed to throw his whole great soul into his subject, evincing the sincerity of his belief that the cause he advocated was that of truth and justice, all these created a power of eloquence which few could resist." George Farrar adds, in Johnsonian style, that "he was pleasant without ostentation."

"He was sure," says Hervey Bingham, a lifelong friend, "to understand the subject of his recitation; sometimes, I used to think, in a more extended and more comprehensive sense than his teachers . . . He was a favorite with the class generally; interesting and instructive in conversation; social and very kind in his feelings; not intimate with many." "All his exercises," according to his class-mate Elisha Hotchkiss, "through his whole collegiate course, improved in excellence as time advanced . . . His range of study was more general than that of his class-mates. The ease with which he acquired knowledge afforded him much time for promiscuous reading." His mode of recitation, according to the recollection of Nathaniel Shattuck, also of the class of 1801, "was prompt and off-hand; ever standing side by side with the best specimens of scholarship in his class, and in some particulars, especially in composition and oratory, ahead of them all . . . He possessed a very clear and comprehensive mind, and on graver subjects

was bold and lion-like in language." A minor but not universally prevalent merit is mentioned by Professor Sanborn in the remark that "all the early manuscripts of Daniel and Ezekiel Webster are remarkable for their plain, legible chirography, with scarcely a blot or erasure, and for their accurate spelling and punctuation."

Samuel Lorenzo Knapp, of the class of 1804, who was the first to write a history of American literature and a life of Webster, says in the latter that there was no mannerism or reigning fashion in the democratic Dartmouth of Webster's day, no uniformity of coats, caps, or thoughts," but that, in his rather remarkable phrase, "the alumni exhibited a *wilderness of free minds*, over whom *alma mater* had no other control than the exactions of a respectful compliance to a few necessary rules in order to secure the ordinary duties of a student. Mr. Webster was distinguished in his class for a general knowledge of all the branches of learning taught in the College, but much more for a bold, strong, independent manner of thinking and of expressing his opinions. He grappled with authors at that time not simply to make himself master of what they wrote, but to test their merits by a standard of his own. If such a mind is not always right in its conclusions it is certainly on the road to truth . . . The scholars acknowledged his great talents and the faculty sanctioned their opinion of his merits. The professor of natural philosophy, Judge Woodward, who lived but three years after Mr. Webster left College, often spoke of him in high terms, and accompanied his remarks with a confident prophecy of his future eminence. 'That man's victory is certain,' said the sage professor, 'who reaches the heart through the medium

of the understanding. He gained me by combating my opinions, for I often attacked him merely to try his strength.' 'The good old professor,' adds Knapp, "was then in the wane of life, but if his struggles with his pupils lacked something of his former energy (for he was in the prime of life a strong man, and had but few equals in the field of argument), still there was such a sincerity in his opinion, and so much of his former insight into character remained, that all were prepared to expect and believe his visions of coming days." I fear that Professor Woodward was not the last Dartmouth instructor who had to "struggle" with his pupils as they "exhibited a wilderness of free minds."

There is a little more of the sub-acid in the recollections of his room-mate Aaron Loveland of Norwich, Vermont, who survived until 1870. A living resident of that town, a nephew of Judge Loveland, says that he often heard his mother or grandmother tell about the Judge's bringing Mr. Webster to the Loveland homestead, when they were in College, on Saturdays to hunt. Webster was rather rough and awkward in his manners, and troubled the grandmother by so putting his feet upon the soft soapstone around the fireplace as to scratch it; and so she told Aaron not to bring his friend any more if he was going to scratch her Orford soapstone. On a July afternoon in 1857, thirteen years before his death, Judge Loveland sat down in a hayfield west of Norwich and gave to Rev. S. W. Boardman, then the village pastor, some reminiscences of Webster's college days, which Mr. Boardman immediately jotted down. "I roomed with Webster," said he, "about one year.

He was very ambitious in college from the first, and took every opportunity to make himself conspicuous. He had unbounded self-confidence, seemed to feel that a good deal belonged to him, and evidently intended to be a great man in public life. He was rather bombastic and always ready for a speech. One day he was reading Addison's 'Cato,' putting it off in great style, when he pronounced 'Utica' as if the first letter was short; I corrected him, and he said I was right. He did a great deal in his college society, and received almost unbounded flattery from his fellow-members. They thought he was great. It was common for others to say they overestimated him. He was not very popular with the class, owing to his being so independent and assuming. On one occasion, when some matter was discussed before the class, the side which he advocated received but few votes, whereupon he got up and left the room. He would appear rather stuffy if things did not go to suit him, though he took no special pains at electioneering. On the whole, he was regarded as our ablest man; if anything was to be done he was generally appointed. He never refused; would always take hold and get off something, and generally did well. His funeral oration for Simonds was very good, but produced no extraordinary effect. He came to college from a tavern kept by his father, who was in embarrassed circumstances. His father was at our room while we were together. He said that if he had received education in youth, he could have done anything he chose. Dan was rough and awkward, very decidedly, and I sometimes doubted whether he would succeed in life on that account. Yet there was something rather assuming and pompous in his

bearing as well as his style. He observed things remarkably, and was quick to see their bearings. He was, and felt himself to be, a kind of oracle. He read the newspapers and kept himself posted upon political affairs remarkably for a young man. He read a good deal also of general reading. If any distinguished men were about, he would manage to fall in with them; met more than most students, and was distinguished, in the community around the College, for the extent and readiness of his political knowledge. He was a good, though not a very accurate, scholar. He would occasionally come over here to Norwich, Saturdays, to hunt with me. Dan seldom hit anything. He became precisely the man to be the pet of merchants. He was ambitious through life, and did well till the last, when he foolishly sought the Southern vote. He ought to have known that he would never secure it. He had spoken too much and too well against slavery for them ever to forget or forgive. I consider ambition his one fault and weakness." On another occasion, Judge Loveland said that he often walked and talked with Webster, and that his conversation was philosophical or political, far above the ordinary gossip of other young men.

Webster got no small amount of practice in speech-making in the United Fraternity, so often mentioned. It was one of the two rival societies among the students, the regular exercises of which consisted of essays, debates, and orations of the sort so long common in New England colleges and country "lyceums." Thus Webster shared or increased undergraduate wisdom on the following questions, among others (I quote from the records): "Would it be good policy to treat an individ-

ual of the French nation with that respect we should one of another, in present circumstances?" "Would it be just for the United States to grant letters of Mark and Reprisal against the French Republic?" "Should a scholar attend as much to ancient as modern writings?" "Is the study of the Latin language preferable to Greek?" and so on. The records sometimes append "yes" or "no" to perpetuate the opinion of the members as expressed in the subsequent vote. An unhesitating affirmative gave the Dartmouth view of the query, "Is marriage productive of happiness?" and even, "Is a collegiate education conducive to happiness?"; but the more guarded word "conditional" was appended to the still-mooted inquiry, "Ought separate schools to be provided for the education of the different sexes?"

The books of the society show the usual dreary memorials of insecure undergraduate orthography, lazy secretaries, speakers unprepared, exercises postponed, small attendance, and fines; but Webster, who gradually became its most important member, was always ready, and once gave a volunteer oration the very week before a regular one was duly delivered by him.

Two of Webster's undergraduate speeches survive in print: this eulogy of his class-mate Simonds, and his Fourth of July, 1800, oration before the citizens of Hanover. Of the former, however genuine its feeling and sincere its endeavor, the modern reader shares the author's deprecatory opinion. A funeral oration that is not verbose and platitudinous is rare indeed; great would have been the saving of words and of patience if more of the dead had been allowed to bury their own dead. That the Johnsonian style was still potent is shown by

such an aspiration as, "May his virtues ever live in our practice, as his memory ever must in our minds"; while the vogue of Mackenzie, the "Man of Feeling," is suggested by the remark that "little, indeed, is he fitted to cull the flowers of rhetoric, whose bosom still bleeds for the loss of its inmate, whose powers are overwhelmed in the flood of sensibility." But not unworthy was such a phrase as "the dull, funeral toll," or the well-balanced sentence: "He has entered the innermost of the temple of eternity, and left us treading in the vestibule." A local touch is: "He walks not the aisles of yonder building"—Dartmouth Hall being the only one to be mentioned; and as we stroll in our beautiful graveyard we may recall that it has been commemorated in such sonorous words as these: "All of him that was mortal now lies in the charnels of yonder cemetery. By the grass that nods over the mounds of Sumner, Merrill, and Cook, now rests a fourth son of Dartmouth, constituting another monument of man's mortality. The sun, as it sinks to the ocean [sic], plays its departing beams on his tomb, but they re-animate him not. The cold sod presses on his bosom, his hands hang down in weakness. The bird of evening shouts a melancholy air on the poplar, but her voice is stillness to his ears." The stones of Sumner, Merrill, Cook, and Simonds still stand side by side in the older part of our "dead man's garden"; that of Simonds was set up by the United Fraternity soon after his death.

The most salient and illustrating event of Webster's whole college career was the Fourth of July oration delivered in the closing year of the eighteenth century before the citizens of Hanover. With all its faults, it was,

and it remains, an interesting anticipation of the vital belief and life-work of the greatest American orator, concerning a thing that was destined to be profoundly connected with the struggles of the next seventy-five years: the nature and powers of the Federal Union of states of the western world. In this microcosm we have in a crude form several of the future orator's most prominent qualities: his mingling of Latin derivatives with old English words; his balanced periods, alternating with language of straight-forward simplicity; and, above all, an occasional suggestion of that power in which he surpasses Demosthenes, Cicero, and Burke, the power of making the very point under discussion seem so axiomatic as to render debate almost superfluous. Webster was afterward ashamed of some of the bathetic passages in this speech, which would certainly be obnoxious to the blue pencils of our instructors in rhetoric in the Dartmouth of to-day. The "gasconading pilgrim of Egypt" was naturally a bugaboo in the dawning century, and the embrace of France, which, "not yet satiated with the contortions of expiring republics," had "spouted her fury across the Atlantic," was death; therefore the young orator proffered, as his final question and answer, the startling query: "Shall we pronounce the sad benediction to Freedom, and immolate liberty on the altar our fathers had raised to her! No! The response of a nation is, no! Let it be registered on the archives of Heaven: ere the religion we profess, and the privileges we enjoy, are sacrificed at the shrines of despots and demagogues let the pillars of creation tremble! Let world be wrecked on world, and systems rush to ruin!" But other parts of the speech are

significant in a different way. The eulogist of the Pilgrim Fathers is foreshadowed in this passage : "We behold a feeble band of colonists, engaged in the arduous undertaking of a new settlement in the wilds of North America. Their civil liberty being mutilated, and the enjoyment of their religious sentiments denied them in the land that gave them birth, they fled their country, they braved the dangers of the then almost unnavigated ocean, and sought on the other side the globe an asylum from the iron grasp of tyranny and the more intolerable scourge of ecclesiastical persecution." And the Adams and Jefferson speech seems anticipated in these words of the boy of eighteen : "The solemn Declaration of Independence is now pronounced, amidst crowds of admiring citizens, by the supreme council of our nation, and received with the unbounded plaudits of a grateful people. That was the hour when patriotism was proved, when the souls of men were tried. It was then, ye venerable patriots, it was then you stretched the indignant arm, and unitedly swore to be free. Despising such toys as subjugated empires, you then knew no middle fortune between liberty and death. Firmly relying on the patronage of Heaven, unwarped in the resolution you had taken, you then, undaunted, met, engaged, defeated the gigantic power of Britain, and rose triumphant over the ruins of your enemies. Trenton, Princeton, Bennington, and Saratoga were the successive theatres of your victories, and the utmost bounds of creation are the limits to your fame." This is Websterian English ; nor is it too much to say that we also hear the religious note of Lincoln in the solemn sentence : "If piety be the rational exercise of the human

soul, if religion be not a chimera, and if the vestiges of heavenly assistance are clearly traced in those events which mark the annals of our nation, it becomes us on this day, in consideration of the great things which the Lord has done for us, to render the tribute of unfeigned thanks to God who superintends the universe and holds aloft the scale that weighs the destinies of nations."

Passing an interesting illustration of the triplicate form which Webster was so frequently to use—"For us they fought, for us they bled, for us they conquered"—and an allusion to "Dartmouth, towering majestic above the groves which encircle her," and now inscribing "her glory on the registers of fame," we find the keynote of the speech, the sign of the life-work of Webster the expounder of Constitutional Union, in these words: "No sooner was peace restored with England, the first grand article of which was the acknowledgment of our independence, than the old system of confederation, dictated at first by necessity, and adopted for the purposes of the moment, was found inadequate to the government of an extensive empire. Under a full conviction of this, we then saw the people of these states engaged in a transaction which is undoubtedly the greatest approximation towards human perfection the political world ever yet experienced, and which, perhaps, will forever stand on the history of mankind without a parallel. A great republic, composed of different states, whose interest, in all respects, could not be perfectly compatible, then came deliberately forward, discarded one system of government, and adopted another, without the loss of one man's blood. There is not a single government now existing in Europe which is not based

in usurpation, and established, if established at all, by the sacrifice of thousands. But, in the adoption of our present system of jurisprudence, we see the powers necessary for the government voluntarily springing from the people, their only proper origin, and directed to the public good, their only proper object."

While an undergraduate, Webster was keenly interested in national politics, being, like most of the faculty and constituency of the College, Federalist in sympathy. From " Beechnut Hall, Hanover, Dec. 28, 1800," he wrote: "Long are the faces of the Hanoverians. Jefferson's Presidency, which now seems certain, sits not very well on our stomachs. All the tonics of our political faculty cannot make it digest readily. Burr, too, nettles us more than any vegetable burr in our fields. However, what cannot be cured must be endured." In the same letter he added, on a more general theme: "I am fully persuaded that our happiness is much at our regulation, and that the 'know thyself' of the Greek philosopher meant no more than rightly to attune and soften our appetites and passions till they should symphonize like the harp of David. Mr. Stewart has shown us some fine ideas on it. He is an author whom I admire more than any writer I have perused."

He who wrote thus had a heart as well as a mind. No episode in Webster's college course meant more to him than the arrival of his brother Ezekiel, accompanied by his father, in March, 1801, to join the Freshman class; then and for several years to be aided intellectually and financially by his loyal predecessor in college life. The Kentucky novelist, James Lane Allen, in his recent picture of the poverty brought upon a hemp-

farmer by his son's residence, for a year or two, in an inexpensive college, could present to us nothing more effective than Webster's own account of the Salisbury household immediately after his graduation : "Returning home after Commencement, I found, on consideration, that it would be impossible for my father, under existing circumstances, to keep Ezekiel at college. Drained of all his little income by the expenses of my education thus far, and broken down in his exertions by some family occurrences, I saw he could not afford Ezekiel means to live abroad with ease and independence, and I knew too well the evils of penury to wish him to stay half beggared at college. I thought it, therefore, my duty to suffer some delay in my profession, for the sake of serving my elder brother, and was making a little interest in some places to the eastward for employment." Never has there been a time, from that day to this, as some of you know by your own tender memories, when Dartmouth men have not made a little interest for employment, and suffered some delay in their profession, that they might give a brother the power to enjoy the advantages of the college of their love.

A lie dies with proverbial procrastination ; like the snapping-turtle's heart, when thrown on the pavement, it persistently beats long after life has left the rest of the sluggish body. But surely, after a hundred years, it is time to give final interment to the venerable mendacity that Webster, on Commencement day, withdrew to the rear of Dartmouth Hall and tore up his diploma. It rests upon no authority ; it is contradicted by common sense ; it is inconsistent with Webster's frequent visits to Hanover within a few years of his graduation, and

his affectionate correspondence concerning the town and the College, to which he sent his brother and his son; and it is explicitly denied by his chief biographer and literary executor, as well as by Professor Shurtleff and other immediate contemporaries or eye-witnesses of his graduation, some of whom never heard of it until a quarter of a century later. His class-mate Smith stood at Webster's side when he "received his degree with a graceful bow"; and the same clergyman adds: "Such was my connection with him in our society affairs that if he had destroyed it afterward I should certainly have known it." Far truer would be the assertion that no graduate of an American college, by the acts and words of a lifetime—words culminating in the most famous of tributes to an institution of learning—ever gave more distinguished proof of his love for the seminary where he began his work for the world. Let there be *præterea nihil* of Charles Lanman's poor fable of the torn diploma, thrown to the winds on the alleged "green" east of Dartmouth Hall, while Webster shouted, as a valedictory oration: "My industry may make me a great man, but this miserable parchment cannot"; or of Theodore Parker's gratuitous inaccuracy that he "scorned his degree, and when the faculty gave him his diploma, he tore it to pieces in the College yard, in the presence of some of his mates, it is said, and trod it under foot." It must have been a matter of regret to these two historical thinkers that a third authority in a published wood-cut portrayed the scene as visible in a third locality, the rear of the College church. The truth concerning his own disappointment, or the keener regret of his class-mates, over his failure to receive a Commence-

ment part is probably to be found in the recollections of Judge Samuel Swift, who said that Thomas A. Merrill, afterwards pastor in Middlebury, Vt. (the judge's own home), was deemed by the faculty the most correct recitation scholar in the class, and thus given the salutatory, the first appointment for Commencement, the class being allowed to elect the valedictorian, which they failed to do, because of a Social and Frater quarrel, desiring and expecting, however, that the faculty would appoint Webster, which was not done. In other words, there seems to have been a "class row," after which some of Webster's class-mates blamed the faculty for not doing what they had failed to do themselves. "As long as Webster lived," said Professor Sanborn, "he believed society feuds deprived him of his honors," an influential professor having belonged to the Social Friends; but the same authority adds: "I cannot say that Mr. Webster's suspicions were well grounded." The idea of professorial confusion between society prejudices and undergraduate appointments is more prevalent than sound. It seems that the faculty offered Webster the choice between an English poem or an English oration, neither of which he felt at liberty to take, for reasons now obscure, so that he and some others were "excused from speaking," on their own motion. Webster was too large a man to allow a real or fancied grievance to cloud Commencement day or his tender memories of the "small college" he did so much to make famous; and meanwhile he satisfied the Fraternity division of his class by giving an oration the day before Commencement. Caleb Tenney, afterwards a minister in Rhode Island and Connecticut, was the man who got the

valedictory appointment. Judge Swift thought Tenney a good scholar and an excellent young man. The same judicial authority, I may add, bore testimony to the fact that Webster, while not technically "leading the class," had the best all-round mind and the broadest influence, a condition which has very often been repeated in subsequent classes, in the opinion of those of us who, though possibly not Websters, were certainly not valedictorians. Dr. Merrill, the Latin salutatorian and highest scholar, himself, modestly wrote in 1853 that "the Faculty thought it would be almost barbarous to set the best English scholar in the class [Webster] to jabber in Latin." While quoting Dr. Merrill, let me suggest to those of you who may similarly be called upon for reminiscences of famous class-mates, to copy the discreet form elsewhere adopted by him when asked for recollections of Webster: "I presume, confidently, that he was never concerned in any mischief. I suppose that he acted upon the principle of mastering his lessons and attending on all the exercises of the college, both literary and religious."

But we must not dwell longer upon the earlier days of one whose later years were to be so rich and full.

It is the power of the poet to gather into a few luminous words some fadeless picture of memory or imagination. Seldom has a lifetime been more successfully portrayed in four lines than in one stanza of Oliver Wendell Holmes' poem on the birthday of Daniel Webster, written four years after the statesman's death. The signer, as well as the subject, had trodden Dartmouth ground and sat within these walls; and so it was natural that one line of this comprehensive stanza should be

devoted to Webster's college life. Let me close by recalling his fitly chosen words, for they must often recur to our minds during the remaining hours of these memorial days :

“A roof beneath the mountain pines ;
The cloisters of a hill-girt plain ;
The front of life's embattled lines ;
A mound beside the heaving main.”

The Development of the College Since the Dartmouth College Case.

Address by Professor John King Lord, Ph. D., '68.

THE history of the College, like that of the country, presents several well marked periods. There is the period of discovery and settlement, the period of storm and struggle, and the period of later development. The first two periods, including Eleazar Wheelock's coming to New Hampshire and the founding of the College, and the contest between the College and the State settled by the decision of the Supreme Court at Washington, are romantic, exciting and well known. The last period, covering more time nearly twice over than the other two, presents few points of interest except such as are naturally connected with the growth of an institution. It is my purpose to-day to give a brief outline of the change of the “small college” of Daniel Webster's day into the larger institution whose one hundred and thirty-two years are crowned

with honor and influence, and lighted with the promise of still greater good.

The condition of the College after the decision at Washington was lamentable in the extreme. It was indeed victorious; it had established its rights, but it had little else in which to rejoice. Its two buildings were in poor condition, while its property was scanty and in disorder. Most of this was in lands, and tenants, while the rival claims of the College and the State were unsettled, had hesitated in paying rents and after the case was adjudicated were slow to respond to the demands of the College trustees for what was due. There had been some loss in tuition, and in 1819 the trustees estimated their loss in tuition, room-rents, fees, etc., at \$8,771.50. In addition to the disorganization of its income the College was in debt to its own officers for overdue salaries, to outsiders for money borrowed, and to the estate of John Wheelock, so that in 1820 a committee of the trustees reported the resources of the College, at a favorable reckoning, as falling below its liabilities by \$2,924.95. The victory of the College had not turned opponents into friends, and a large portion of the state was unwilling to render any assistance even if it did not actually support plans of a hostile nature. But the crowning disaster was the death of its able and beloved president, Francis Brown, who worn out by his labors died on the 27th of July, 1820.

On the other hand the trustees still held to their purpose, and were determined that victory should not be mocked by despair. To their support came a large party, especially the clergymen of the state, while the student body held to its allegiance and maintained its

numbers. Using their victory with moderation the trustees received the students of the University on the same terms as students from any New England college, and endeavored in other ways to conciliate their opponents.

What they had most to fear was the establishment of a rival college in the state, and plans to this end were several times broached. The Medical College, in which the State had an interest, was a nucleus about which many schemes gathered, one in particular being a proposition by a Dr. Alexander Ramsay, a Scotchman, to open with the aid of the State a Medical School at Concord. But the good sense of the State prevailed and one after another all these schemes fell through. Yet they caused anxiety, and at one time the trustees, in recognition of the interest of the State, proposed as a counter move that a board of overseers, similar to the one in the University, with a veto power on the board of trustees, be appointed by the governor and be self-perpetuating. The suggestion seems to have come in all good faith from President Allen of the University and to have found much favor with the trustees, but it was abandoned under the emphatic advice of Mr. Webster, who saw in it only ill. In 1825 a bill was introduced into the New Hampshire House to establish such a board, accompanied by a grant (one half of the literary fund and one half the receipts from it for ten years), but it was postponed till the next session and never reappeared. In 1827 a bill to establish a state institution in Merrimac county to be called the "New Hampshire University" passed the Senate, but was rejected in the House at the first reading by a vote of 121 to 58, so

great a change had come over that body. With that vote ended the apprehension of hostile legislation.

The succession to the presidency caused much anxiety. The Rev. Daniel Dana, D. D., of Newburyport, Mass., a graduate of 1788, who was chosen to succeed Pres. Brown, entered on office Oct. 25, 1820, but almost immediately his health failed and he resigned within the year. After some delay the Rev. Bennett Tyler of South Britain, Conn., was chosen in his place and was inaugurated March 27, 1822. He was a preacher of unusual excellence, of winning personality, and of earnestness, well adapted to gain friends for the College. The years of his administration were years of recovery, of re-organization and of preparation. In fact the decision of the controversy was hardly made when steps were taken to advance. During the four years from 1815 all the instruction in the College had been given by the President, Professors Adams and Shurtliff, and two tutors. In 1819 the faculty was enlarged by the appointment of the Rev. Charles B. Haddock as professor of rhetoric and oratory. In 1820 Wm. Chamberlain was elected professor of Greek and Latin, and the medical faculty was strengthened by a professor of chemistry. In 1823 there was established the chair of natural philosophy, and for the first time in the catalogue the distinction was made between the "Academical" and the "Medical" departments, indicative of the enlarging ideas. In 1826 the Sophomore tutor was discontinued and the class put in charge of a professor. The appointment of Professor Haddock was followed by the establishment of rhetorical and oratorical prizes, the money for the prizes being given partly by individuals

and partly by the trustees, and of rhetorical exhibitions of the three upper classes, called from the time of their occurrence, in November, March and May, "Quarter Days." The two literary societies of the College, the Social Friends and the United Fraternity, were brought into renewed activity and a strong stimulus given to literary and rhetorical study.

The movement of College life and indeed the progress of the College may best be seen from matters that are in themselves of no great moment. In 1820 the catalogue, then published by the Sophomore class, was changed from a broadside into a pamphlet, though still but a list of names, and first in 1822 contained the terms of admission which were as follows: It was required "that the candidate be well versed in the Grammar of the English, Latin and Greek languages, in Virgil, Cicero's Select Orations, Sallust, the Greek Testament, Dalzel's Collectanea Græca Minora, Latin and Greek Prosody, Arithmetick, and Ancient and Modern Geography; and that he be able accurately to translate English into Latin." In 1823 the catalogue contained the names of the state officers, *ex officio* members of the board in relation to funds given by the state, and was printed by Isaac Hill, the publisher of the N. H. Patriot, and the leader of the former University party, indications of the change in feeling. In that same year and the next President Tyler solicited a fund of \$10,000, now known as the "Charity Fund," the income of which was to be used in paying the tuition of students intending to be ministers. Toward this fund Mr. Hill gave \$50. In 1822 stoves were put into Dartmouth Hall and the fireplaces, which hitherto had been the

only means of heating, were bricked up. Think, ye that in 1901 complain of steam-heated radiators, what Dartmouth Hall was in 1822 ! In 1824 the recitation rooms, which had been the rooms of the students themselves, and had been furnished and cared for by them, were provided and furnished by the College. In the same year the policy of the College in the treatment of negroes was settled. Edward Mitchell, a negro born in Martinique, W. I., who had accompanied President Brown on his return from the South in 1820, having since that time been an inmate of his house, applied for admission to College. The trustees at first declined to admit him, fearing that his presence would not be acceptable to the students, but they on hearing of the matter held a meeting and requested that he might be admitted. He was admitted and was graduated in 1828.

A College uniform was adopted in 1825, approved by the faculty and trustees, but not made compulsory. "It consisted of a black single-breasted coat with rolling collar, having on the left breast a sprigged diamond three and a half inches long and three inches wide : and on the left sleeve half a sprigged diamond for Freshmen, two halves placed one above the other for Sophomores, three for Juniors, and four for Seniors : with black or white pantaloons, stockings, vests and cravats. * * It was quite generally adopted, but survived no longer than the first suit lasted."

The life of the students was very frugal. "Most of them," says a student of the time, "defrayed their expenses by teaching school. * * There was among them great plainness of dress and furniture, and great

freedom from all forms of expensive amusement and dissipation." Their surroundings and discipline were Spartan. As is well known, morning prayers were held as soon as it was light enough to read and a recitation was held before breakfast. Evening prayers were held at five o'clock, or as late as the light permitted, and on Tuesdays a "dissertation by one of the Seniors followed the religious exercises." Morning chapel continued to be held before breakfast till 1856, and evening prayers were given up only in 1863. The chapel had no means of heating and fervency of devotion was the only protection against the winter's cold. On Sundays the students attended morning and evening prayers and also forenoon and afternoon services in the church, while a biblical exercise was attended in the evening or Monday morning. "During the Sabbath," so ran the laws of the College, "each student shall remain in his chamber unless the duties of public worship or acts of necessity or mercy call him elsewhere—and whoever shall on that day attend to any secular business or to diversion, or shall make any improper noise, or shall unnecessarily walk in the fields or streets or elsewhere shall be subject to the penalties mentioned in the foregoing section." Cards, dice and all unlawful games were prohibited, as well as the keeping or firing of gunpowder in or near the College premises. Fines were a common form of discipline, and five to twenty-five cents were imposed for failure to perform an exercise, but "one recitation and two prayers per week [were] free from fines."

The faculty "was particularly and earnestly recommended" by the trustees "to exercise as far as possible a parental authority, to inform themselves concerning each

one's moral and literary character * * and in frequent and familiar intercourse to administer caution, counsel and encouragement, * * to reprove any known violation of decorum and to check every perceived tendency to negligence or dissipation." That this might be secured there were to be weekly visitations of students in their rooms, by members of the faculty assigned for that purpose.

President Tyler resigned in 1828, being drawn to the work of the pulpit for which he was eminently fitted. In his stead was chosen the Rev. Nathan Lord, D. D., a graduate of Bowdoin in 1809, then a minister in Amherst, N. H., and already a trustee of the College. After much hesitation he accepted and was inaugurated October 29, 1828. Two years before a committee of the trustees, of which he was the leading member, had been appointed "to take into consideration the whole internal affairs of the College." Their report together with one made by a similar committee, of which Mr. Lord was chairman, two years later, became the basis of far-reaching changes. Fines were abolished, the marking system was introduced, the courses of study re-arranged, examination for entrance by at least three members of the faculty, a name first used in 1828, was required, provision made for an examining committee from abroad, and an annual report by the president on the state of the College was provided for. It is interesting to note that the report contains a discussion of the place of Greek in college and leans decidedly to the view that it should be elective. Within two years several changes took place in the faculty. A new department of moral philosophy and political economy was

established and also one of chemistry and mineralogy, and in 1829 "Algebra to simple Equations, an abridged system of Rhetorick and some History of the United States" were added to the requirements for admission, but the last two were withdrawn in 1837.

The number of students which from 1815 to 1820 had been about one hundred had increased under President Tyler to about one hundred and seventy besides the medical students who numbered about one hundred, but for a few years had declined, the impression having gained ground that the buildings of the College were decayed and that accommodations were not as good as elsewhere. In 1827 the trustees recognizing the situation voted thoroughly to repair the buildings, two in number, Dartmouth Hall and the chapel, which stood nearly on the present site of Thornton Hall, to clear the grounds and to surround them by a fence, and that a subscription of fifty thousand dollars be started with special reference to new buildings. The work lagging it was voted the next year to repair "The College," and to remove the chapel and to erect two new buildings of brick at an estimated cost of \$12,000. The foundations of the two buildings, Thornton and Wentworth Halls, were laid by Aug. 1828 and the buildings were completed in October 1829. The cost exceeded \$16,000. A "suitable fence" was built in front of the College yard, the dial face in the western gable of Dartmouth Hall was first made alive with a clock, and the bell was hung which called the students to their work for nearly forty years till it cracked in 1867. The subscription, which was conditioned on raising \$30,000, was vigorously begun by President Tyler and later completed by Presi-

dent Lord, though made binding in the end only by a subscription of \$700 by himself.

The decade beginning with 1830 was marked by great changes and great growth. The spring of that year was also made remarkable by a College rebellion. The uncertainties incident to a change of administration, the issuing of a new and more stringent code of laws by the trustees, the change in the course of study with the rigorous requirement of an afternoon recitation, hitherto largely a matter of form, and the occupancy of the new dormitory bringing the students into closer association, resulted in "various irregularities and disturbances which the ordinary influences of authority could not prevent." Several students were severely disciplined and the College rose in rebellion, but President Lord in addressing it uttered the famous sentence, effective then, and throughout his administration, "Go, young gentlemen, if you wish, we can bear to see our seats vacated, but not our laws violated," and authority was restored.

The changes in the faculty were many. In 1831 Calvin E. Stowe took the chair of Greek and Latin, but was succeeded two years later by the accomplished scholar Alphens Crosby. With him was associated in 1835 Edwin D. Sanborn, whom so many of the graduates of the middle life most cordially remember, and who in 1837 on the division of the chair became professor of Latin. Oliver P. Hubbard, who died but a little over a year ago, entered the faculty in 1836 as associate professor of physical sciences, but the next year he became professor of chemistry, mineralogy and geology. In 1838 Rev. David Peabody took the chair of rhetoric and oratory in place of Professor Haddock who in turn had

succeeded Dr. Oliver in the chair of intellectual philosophy, to which was joined English literature. Natural philosophy and mathematics were also separated, Ira Young retaining the former, and Stephen Chase being made professor of mathematics. In this year Professor Shurtliff became Professor *Emeritus*, as Professor Adams had done five years before, thus removing from active service the last member of the faculty who had shared in the great controversy. The appointment of a professor of modern languages was earnestly discussed by the board and it was voted to appoint one, but the funds were lacking, and for a series of years instruction was given by individuals paid by the students, though the College contributed about one quarter of the stipend. French appears as an elective in the course of study in 1851, but it was not until 1859 that a professor of modern languages was appointed when William A. Packard, now a member of the faculty of Princeton University, was chosen to that place. Two professorships were partially endowed in 1838, the Hall professorship of mineralogy and geology and the Evans professorship of oratory and *belles lettres*.

At the beginning of the decade the medical faculty consisted of two professors besides Professor Hale who gave instruction in chemistry. At its close, besides Professor Hubbard in place of Professor Hale and one lecturer, there were four professors, among whom were Dixie Crosby, eminent among a family of physicians, and the afterward famous Oliver Wendell Holmes.

The exterior of the College so greatly improved by the erection of the new buildings and the fencing of the yard was still further advanced by the levelling and the

enclosure of the common in 1835. Indicative of the general progress, was the change of Commencement in 1834 from the last Wednesday of August to the last Wednesday in July, for which, however, Thursday was substituted the next year, and this continued to be the date of Commencement till 1863 when it was placed one week earlier. This was changed in 1877 to the last Thursday of June for which again Wednesday, the present date, was substituted in 1894. In 1832 for the first time the Senior class was invited to attend the public dinner at Commencement and "eight cents were added to the quarter bills of every student" to meet the expense. In 1837 the salaries of the professors were raised from \$700 to \$900, at which sum they continued till 1854 when \$200 more were added to them.

An increased literary spirit was evidenced by attempts of the students, though unsuccessful, in 1835 and 1837 to establish a literary magazine. In 1839 another attempt was successful and *The Dartmouth* continued till 1844-45 when it died, but it re-appeared twenty years later in 1867, and having changed from a literary magazine to a college paper it still continues a vigorous existence. Its former place was taken by the *Dartmouth Literary Monthly* in 1887. The same impulse led to the establishment in 1841 of the Greek letter societies, the Psi Upsilon fraternity having the first chapter and others following. That they did not meet with the entire favor of the authorities is shown by a vote of the trustees in 1846 that "after 1849 no further elections be made for members of any other societies [than Phi Beta Kappa, Social Friends, United Fraternity and Theological] except by permission of

the faculty." The permission however seems to have been freely given for there was no interruption in the life of the societies.

In 1837 Moor Hall, or the "Academy" as it was called, was erected for the use of Moor's School, but it passed in the fifties to the use of the Chandler School, was remodelled in 1871 and again in 1898 into the present Chandler Building. In the next year (or in 1839) a new building was begun on the site of the old President Wheelock house, which was moved to its present site where it is now known as the Howe Library. The new building was finished in 1840 and named Reed Hall in honor of William Reed, a trustee, who left a bequest to the College, but its cost, about \$15,000, was a severe tax upon the resources of the College as the legacy of Mr. Reed did not become available for nearly twenty years.

One of the marked changes introduced by President Lord was the abolition of honors. The marking system was but just introduced, as I have said, and before its introduction the only distinctions of scholarship had been the appointments to the exhibitions on the "Quarter Days." These had given rise to endless friction and the Sophomore exhibition had been abolished in 1823. The Junior exhibition disappeared in 1832, leaving "the honors of the College to be gathered only once—at the time of graduation." But the same trouble appeared as at the Quarter Days, and in 1834 on the recommendation of the president, supported by a petition from the larger part of the students, college honors were abolished and Commencement parts were assigned to the whole class, but prize speaking was continued till 1838. As

the class of 1835 numbered fifty it can be imagined that Commencement day was almost beyond endurance, and though the trustees voted that if necessary the exercises might be extended over two days, yet it was found better to restrict the number of speakers, which was done at first by excusing, but after 1839 by lot. This method continued through President Lord's administration, though not without strong opposition. After the first the faculty desired the restoration of honors and in 1840 all its members but one joined in a request to that end, but the trustees held with the President, as they did again in 1858 when the alumni in Boston presented a memorial asking for the restoration of honors and the establishment of prizes. Their answer set forth by President Lord based their refusal on the grounds that such things were unchristian and immoral as making an appeal to wrong motives and hurtful ambition.

It is difficult for those who have seen only the Commencements of late years to appreciate the celebrations of the past. In former years Commencement was not merely an academic celebration, it was a grand festival of the nature and display of a country fair. Instead of the comparatively few alumni and friends of the graduating class who now attend, the village was filled with hundreds and even thousands of people who came in vehicles of every description from all the country about. A man living near once told me that he had not missed a Commencement for fifty years. The southern end of the common was covered with booths of cooks, candymakers, peddlars, nostrum venders, jugglers, gamblers and sellers of hard cider and other harder drinks. Noise, confusion and drunkenness abounded.

In the church were the exercises of a literary institution, on the common the turbulence of a good-natured but howling mob. In 1833 a newspaper correspondent wrote, "I was sorry to see such a host of peddlars, gamblers, drunkards and shows. I was never more astonished than to see at such an anniversary and at such a place the unaccountable degree of immorality and vice. I should think that there were in sight of one another thirty places of gambling. During the performances in the meeting house the vociferations of a dozen auctioneers were to be distinctly heard in the house." Nor was the attendance only of sightseers. Men of note and men of letters graced the occasion besides those who came to give addresses. Among the latter were the most famous of the country and their audiences honored them in character as in numbers. In 1843 a visitor wrote, "The crowd was immense. Thursday there were 1,200 who could not get into the church. I had the honor to hear and shake hands with the immortal Daniel Webster, Levi Woodbury and daughters, Mr. Bronson [the orator of the occasion], Mr. Peabody, Mr. Aiken of Boston, Gen. Root of New York and a whole lot of worthies. I wish you could see Webster: *he* is a *sight* worth seeing. Such a high, expansive, intellectual forehead I never looked upon before and 'ne'er shall look upon his like again.' Bronson said he never addressed so intellectual an audience before in his life. The concert was on Wednesday evening by the negro band from Philadelphia. The music was soul-stirring."

This same visitor gave an account of the Commencement of 1845. "The village has been filled, filled

to overflowing. Herr Dillsbach (manager of a travelling menagerie) and Ole Bull were among the prominent lions of the day. * * [The speaking and conferring of degrees] closed the exercises of Commencement, opening at a little before ten and continuing without intermission until 4 p.m. * * The menagerie was opened in the forenoon and afternoon both. * * * There was such a terrible crowd I did not go, although I should like to have seen some of Dillsbach's wonderful feats. * * Ole Bull's concert came on about 5 o'clock. Tickets \$1.00 apiece. At nine o'clock in the evening we went up to the assembly rooms in the new College [Reed Hall] where the graduating class held their select Levee. It was very tastefully decorated and the tables most magnificently spread. We had peaches, apricots, grapes, oranges, raisins, figs, nuts of all kinds, pickled fish, water melons a foot and a half or two feet long, cakes, ice cream, tea, coffee and lemonade. The students gave this instead of a ball. Kendall's band played and all went off well."*

The College made a remarkable gain in numbers between 1830 and 1840. The average number of stu-

*The following from the diary of a resident of Hanover relates to the same Commencement:

"July 31st. The annual Commencement this day and a fine fair day too. The smallest literary procession that I have noticed for several years—but an uncommon rush of all kinds of people from the circumstance that there was uncommon attractions for them. A somewhat extensive Menagerie of wild animals (in most miserable plight however). The Boston Brass band of musicians, and the famous foreign Violin player named Ole Bull, and 4 Albinos or white negroes. Every thing to pick away money and lead the mind of people from the great concerns of eternity and their duties of charity to their needy fellow citizens and the perishing heathen. Even clergymen were so enraptured that they could not resist the invitation to hand out their half dollar to hear him scrape his catgut—and another quarter to hear the brass band perform."

dents for the fifteen years to 1835 was about 150. In that year it reached 200 and in 1840 it was 340, and in 1842 there were graduated 85, the largest class in the history of the College till recent years. But a rapid decline ensued and instead of a class of a hundred as in 1838 there entered in 1842 a class of but 43, which graduated 30. Comparatively little change occurred till about 1850 when the average attendance rose to about two hundred and fifty in addition to the Chandler and medical students, a permanent gain to the College of about sixty-six per cent. It is difficult to state definitely the causes that led to these changes. The first increase aside from local influences seems to have corresponded with a general movement toward college life throughout New England and the decline to the effect of other institutions and the opening up of railroads that facilitated communication.

The decrease in the number of students with the consequent loss of revenue led the trustees in 1842 to attempt the raising by subscription of a fund of \$50,000. The subscription which was not to be binding unless \$30,000 were subscribed by August 1, 1843 fell \$7,000 short of that condition. Among the subscribers was Samuel Appleton of Boston, who had sent a check for \$1,000. On being notified that it would be returned he declined to receive it and urged the renewal of the subscription. It was again attempted with two years' limitation, but as the limit of time drew near the fund still lacked \$4,000 of completion. Again Mr. Appleton came forward and with a check for \$9,000 both clinched the subscription and raised the amount of the fund to \$35,000. This fund was made the foundation of the

professorship of natural philosophy which in his honor was called the Appleton professorship, and was the first fully endowed chair in the College. The relief given by it to the College finances was very great and enabled the trustees to make sorely needed repairs in the buildings.

The next important gift to the College was the bequest of Abiel Chandler who in 1851 left \$50,000 for "the establishment and support of a permanent department or school of instruction in said College in the practical and useful arts of life." This was a new departure in scientific education and partly for that reason, partly because the oversight of the fund was entrusted to two visitors, the trustees had some hesitation in accepting the gift, but after careful consideration of the legal and educational questions involved the trust was accepted. In the fall of 1852 the new work was opened under the title of the "Chandler Scientific School." The course of study covered three years, and was divided into two "Departments," the Senior of two years, and the Junior "preparatory to the Senior" of one year. The tuition was \$30 and \$20 respectively, the College tuition being \$36*, and the terms of the Senior department corresponded to those of the College, while the Junior had four instead of three. This arrangement continued till 1857 when the course was unified and extended to four years. The fund not being sufficient to support an independent faculty the instruction was given mainly by members of the College faculty at a stipulated rate. This arrangement though productive of some

*Tuition was \$27 in 1848; \$31.50 in 1849; \$36 in 1851; \$42 in 1855; \$51 in 1860.

friction and modified later by the appointment of some who confined their instruction to the Chandler School and formed a distinct faculty, continued till the merging of the school and the College in 1893. The general management of the school, under the president, was given to one man, who for a time was called "Rector." It was fortunate in its chief officers, the first one being Professor James W. Patterson. He was followed by Professor John S. Woodman from 1857 to 1870 and he in turn by Professor Edward R. Ruggles, whose long and efficient service in the school was continued in the College after 1893 as the head of the department of German. The school began with twenty-eight students and for many years made a slow but steady growth. In 1865 in accordance with the expansive views of President Smith's administration it was called the "Chandler Scientific Department." Prudence in the care of its funds and the gifts of friends increased its foundation nearly fourfold.

The equipment of the College for instruction in science was still further increased by the erection of the observatory in 1854. This with its instruments was largely the gift of Dr. George C. Shattuck of the class of 1803. The telescope was purchased in Munich by Professor Ira Young, who went abroad for that purpose, but was replaced by a larger and finer instrument in 1871 when the observatory was re-furnished under the direction of his son, Professor Charles A. Young.

President Lord resigned his office July 24, 1863 after a service of thirty-five years. For some years he had been the foremost exponent of the pro-slavery views then prevalent in the South. Though he never obtrud-

ed these on the students among whom they passed as "peculiarities," and though under him Dartmouth offered an unequalled hospitality to the negro, yet even before the outbreak of the Civil War they had rendered him obnoxious to many, and in June 1863 led an association of ministers to question the desirability of his continuance in the presidency. The trustees in reply to their communication expressed their confidence in the President but dissented strongly from his views. The President immediately resigned on the ground that the action of the trustees imposed a "test" of opinion and that it was "inconsistent with Christian charity and propriety to carry on [his] administration while holding and expressing opinions injurious, as they imagine, to the interests of the College."

The long presidency of Dr. Lord was marked by the growth of which I have spoken, as well as by the increase of the faculty which was doubled between 1828 and 1863, but its prevailing effect was the ideal of manhood which he impressed upon the College. He was a man of strong nature and effective personality so that few of the 2,675 students who received their degrees at his hands failed to be permanently impressed by him. To his direct and long-continued influence was due in no small degree the development among the graduates of Dartmouth of that independence and force of character and action, that self-reliance and loyalty to one another that we call the "Dartmouth Spirit."

The Rev. Asa D. Smith, D. D., of New York City, who was chosen to succeed Dr. Lord, was inaugurated November 18, 1863. His administration of thirteen years was marked by many changes and much enlarge-

ment. There was a return at once to the system of prizes and Commencement appointments by rank, and the Junior exhibition was revived for a few years. There was a substantial addition to the endowment of the College. The church of which Dr. Smith had been pastor contributed \$30,000 as a presidential fund; \$40,000 were received from other sources, and Dr. Smith by personal solicitation raised \$80,000 for the scholarship funds of the College. Many other valuable gifts were made including the gift in 1869 of Judge Richard Fletcher of \$90,000, and the partial foundation of the Lawrence professorship in 1872 of \$15,000. In 1875 the College received the largest individual gift which up to that time had been made to an American college, the bequest of Tappan Wentworth of Lowell, Mass. Mr. Wentworth's estate fell but a little short of \$500,000, but as its use was conditioned on its reaching that sum, and as it suffered a terrible shrinkage in value in the hard times immediately following Mr. Wentworth's death, it did not actually become available to the College till 1895.

Of the many changes that occurred at that time some of them, minor yet significant, are to be mentioned: the introduction of steam heat into Reed Hall in 1874, the introduction of gas into the chapel and recitation rooms in 1872 and into the buildings generally in 1874, the establishment of a reading room, supported by voluntary contributions, in 1866, the partial opening of the College library in 1864 and the merging in 1874 of the libraries of the two literary societies with that of the College under the management of the trustees, the beginning of an athletic organization, in base-

ball, in 1865, the bringing back of Commencement to the last Thursday in June in 1872, the substitution of written for oral examinations except at the close of the year in 1873, and the adoption in 1875 of the certificate system of admission to College.

The centennial of the College in 1869 was celebrated with great preparation and success. There was a great gathering of alumni and friends of the College. In addition to the ordinary programme of Commencement week there were special exercises and meetings of the alumni presided over by Salmon P. Chase, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The literary exercises were addresses, historical and appropriate to the occasion, and special addresses by prominent alumni on the relation of the College to the various pursuits. They were held in a mammoth tent erected on the common, which was commodious but unhappily not water proof, and a heavy thunder shower that came up during the post-prandial exercises of Commencement day caused great dismay, and ruined the eloquence of the speakers and the toilets of the audience. As the rain poured through the canvas judges, litterati, doctors of divinity and professors sought refuge beneath the stage, but the water poured in concentrated force through the cracks between the boards and their last state was worse than their first.

It was largely owing to the exertions of President Smith that the Agricultural College, established on the basis of the congressional land grant, was brought to Hanover and associated with Dartmouth in 1868, but the history of that institution which was removed to Durham in 1892 does not concern us to-day, further

than that its coming to Hanover was believed by President Smith to be of great importance to Dartmouth. Of much more lasting significance was the opening of the Thayer School of Civil Engineering in 1873. It was based upon a gift of \$70,000 by General Silvanus Thayer of the class of 1807, and though not formally was practically a post-graduate school. From the beginning it has been under the direction of Professor Robert Fletcher and though its numbers have been few it has taken rank among the best of its kind and adds a lustre to the College.

The general faculty increased from seventeen members to twenty-nine including the members of the Agricultural College and the Thayer School. The number of students rose from 307 in 1863 to 409 in 1876, the medical students gaining seventeen, the academic forty-five and scientific forty, to which the Agricultural College added twenty-four and the Thayer School six.

Several buildings mark the progress of the period. In 1866 Bissell Hall was built, the finest college gymnasium in New England when erected; in 1870 Culver Hall was built jointly by the College and the Agricultural College, as was also Conant Hall, now Hallgarten, in 1874, while in 1871, as I have said, Moor Hall was enlarged and became the Chandler Building, and in 1871 the Medical College Building was remodelled and improved.

As the result of failing health President Smith resigned December 21, 1876, his resignation taking effect February 1, 1877. He was succeeded by the Rev. Samuel C. Bartlett, D.D., who entering on his duties in

May was inaugurated at Commencement (June 27) of that year.

But I have reached a time whose events are probably known to you all. It will be enough partially to recall them. Under the administration of President Bartlett the course of study was considerably modified by the introduction of electives, the Chandler Scientific Department was changed to the Chandler School of Science and the Arts and the work and relation of that school to the College were the occasion for much discussion and controversy. The Latin Scientific course, omitting Greek as a requirement and leading to the degree of B. L., was established in 1880. The endowments of five professorships were added to the funds and one that had been given earlier became available. The outward sign of advance remains in the buildings erected during his administration, Wilson Hall and Rollins Chapel in 1885, Wheelock Hotel in 1888, the Tower built by the classes from 1885 to 1895 inclusive, Bartlett Hall, the building of the Young Men's Christian Association erected in 1891 and named from President Bartlett, and the Thayer School Building purchased in 1892.

The movement for the representation of the alumni on the board of trust was accomplished in 1891. This movement, begun as far back as the early sixties, met the obstacle of an inflexible charter, that gave complete support to the conservative feeling that feared a change. The discussion between the alumni and the trustees, each having but infrequent meetings, dragged its slow length along till in 1876 the trustees proposed to allow the alumni to nominate four names for each of the next three vacancies on the board, one of which was to be

outside of New Hampshire, and from each four they would elect one. This proposition was accepted and in 1878 three men were chosen to represent the alumni (Messrs. Prescott, Hitchcock and Tucker). But these trustees like the others held a life tenure and it was felt that the alumni still lacked the closeness of touch with the life of the College which they desired. In 1885 the question was again agitated and the final report of the committee then appointed to consider the matter recommended in 1888 the appointment by the alumni of a board of fifteen councillors. But this recommendation fell flat, and a new committee appointed in 1890 proposed and carried through in 1891, with the co-operation of the trustees, the scheme now in use, by which five members of the board are elected by the alumni, one retiring and one being chosen each year.

President Bartlett gave up his office at Commencement, 1892 though he continued as a lecturer till his death in 1898. His successor, the Rev. William J. Tucker, D.D., was inaugurated at the Commencement of 1893 (June 28). The course of his administration is before our eyes and in our hearts. Its watchwords have been unity and enlargement, unity within and without, enlargement for the present and with thought for the future. At the very outset the Chandler School ceased to be a cause of friction and became a constituent part of the College, one of three courses on a common footing. The whole scheme of study has been remodelled to make the closest connection with the schools below and to harmonize and economize time with the graduate schools. The courses of Senior year in particular have been so defined and related that

one year of time is saved in professional study. To the other forces of the College has been added the Tuck School of Administration and Finance, resting on the princely gift of \$400,000 by Mr. Edward Tuck of the class of 1862. For the material evidences of the prosperity of the College you have but to look about you. Butterfield, Wilder, Richardson, Fayerweather and College Halls and the Heating Station have risen since 1893. The Administration Building is begun, Sanborn and Crosby Houses, the Chandler Building and the Medical College have been remodelled and enlarged, all the dormitories have been modernized by the introduction of heat, light and water, other property has been acquired with a view to future needs, the Alumni Oval has given a proper place for athletics, and a new and sufficient water supply for College and village has met the modern requirements that are dependent upon it for health and protection from fire. The general aspect of the College grounds and the village corresponds with this enlargement. The teaching force of the College has risen in this time to nearly twice its former number, and there has been a corresponding increase of students. What the standing of the College is among the alumni and its constituent public, you well know, but however firm it may be it cannot exceed the loyalty and peace within the College.

If Daniel Webster, in whose honor we have met, were to stand among us to-day he could no longer say of Dartmouth as he did in the Supreme Court of the United States, "It is a small college," but he could still say, "There are those who love it." Yes, there are more to love it, and more who love it. They cannot

love more in degree than men in his day, for then men gave their substance and even their lives to it, but they love it as much, and all over the land and in foreign lands, wherever the sons of Dartmouth have gone, their love burns true and strong, and in their hearts they "give a rouse for the College on the hill," and hope and labor for its prosperity. They believe in it now, they trust it for the future and looking at its history with its early romance and later struggles, seeing its progress through its century and a third of life with its present larger outlook, and regarding the long line of great and good men whom, like a "pure fountain," it has sent and still continues to send forth, they may justly say of the College as the great biographer of antiquity said of his hero, *manet mansurumque est in animis hominum, in aeternitate temporum, fama rerum.*

Program.

Formation of Torchlight Procession.

Parade.

Dartmouth Night Speeches,

Melvin Ohio Adams, Esquire, '71.

Charles William Bartlett, Esquire, '68.

Professor Charles Frederick Bradley, '73.

Singing by the Glee Club.

Fireworks.

Bonfire.

Athletic Events.

Singing by the Entire Assemblage.

UESDAY evening was given to the spectacular demonstration of the Centennial, and to the observance of Dartmouth Night. The town was aglow in honor of the occasion; business blocks and residences were decorated with bunting, flags, and lanterns; the campus was in a blaze from the thousands of electric lamps which surrounded it; College Hall, representing the new Dartmouth was brilliantly lighted; across the green stood Dartmouth, typical of the old College, each line of the venerable building, with its graceful belfry, distinct in the mellow light against the background of darkness. The illumination of this building was perfect: one well said of it, "Dartmouth has come to her own." Squarely across the front lighted letters spelled, "Daniel Webster 1801."

The torchlight procession formed under direction of Chief Marshal, Colonel Charles K. Darling, '85; Chief of Staff, Lieutenant Colonel Otis H. Marion, '73; and the Staff, Lieutenant Colonel Horace E. Marion, '66, Austin H. Kenerson, '76, Edward N. Pearson, '81, Benjamin Tenney, '83, Bertrand T. Wheeler, '84, John H. Colby, '85, Daniel B. Ruggles, '90, and Frank E. Barnard, '91. Philip M. Emmott, Sixth Infantry, M. V. M., acted as Chief Bugler.

The faculty wore black, academic gowns and mortar board caps; the students a similar dress, except that each class was distinguished by a particular color, white for the Seniors, blue for the Juniors, scarlet for the Sophomores, and yellow for the Freshmen. The Glee Club was dressed in Colonial garb. The alumni appeared in a Webster costume of blue coat, buff waistcoat, stock, dicky, and tall hat. A band of students in Indian dress disported themselves about the procession. Floats, among them Webster's carriage, the great plow made and used by him at Marshfield, a reproduction of his room within which showed his old hat, chair, and table, and a representation of the first Dartmouth College building, were interspersed. Many transparencies were carried.

The procession, led by the College Band, upon reaching the campus marched and countermarched, presenting a beautiful and striking appearance. The line of march was then taken up Main, across Maynard, and down College Streets. After completing the parade the procession came to a halt, and was massed before the reviewing stand where the trustees of the College were seated, together with the Governor and his Staff,

the invited guests, and the faculty, to listen to brief speeches from some of the alumni, and to view the stereopticon pictures thrown upon a screen in front of Dartmouth Hall. The views were with two exceptions from original paintings and daguerreotypes. There were shown eighteen portraits of Mr. Webster, eight views of places and scenes important in his life, and the last manuscript page of his reply to Hayne. The Glee Club sang several selections.

Immediately after this the bonfire was lighted, the display of fireworks took place, and a number of athletic events were run off upon the campus. Finally all joined in singing Dartmouth songs.

Dartmouth Night Speeches.

In introducing the speakers President Tucker said : "Gentlemen, this is 'Dartmouth Night.' We have simply moved out of doors. We cannot afford to miss altogether the good talking we have had from year to year in the Old Chapel. I take pleasure in introducing to you two or three of our brethren who will abundantly maintain the speaking habit under these changed conditions. First of all I will present Colonel Melvin O. Adams of Boston."

Speech of Melvin Ohio Adams, Esquire, '71.

Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees, Your Excellency, Antique and Admirable Men [Laughter], you who have come down to us from a former generation—at all events as far as your clothes are concerned [Laughter], and you thrice fortunate undergraduates of Dartmouth College of the year 1901, ap-

parently just hatched in all your radiance from this splendid lunar spectroscope—I salute you [Laughter]. Escaped from the wigwam after the “big talk” of the afternoon, you are now to congratulate yourselves that you are on the other side of *Jordan*, in the green fields of Eden [Applause and laughter]. You seem to me an allegory of college life. For I beheld a modest percentage easily pursuing their course, mounted on horses [Laughter], and by far a larger number slowly plodding along the average level of a fine college life, while a few, seated in carriages, rolled comfortably to honorary degrees, like my friend Gallagher who rode with me [Applause and laughter]. The College has thus put these men on her list and they do her perennial honor that more than squares the account [Applause.]

But there is little time for talk. *Non lusisti satis* [Laughter and applause]. I call upon those brave mounted horsemen, the Colonel Darlings [Laughter and applause], the John Colbys, the Bert Wheelers, the Harry Deweys, who either rode or walked, we were uncertain which, to give me a free translation [Laughter]. Even the president of the College fails to say that “he is prepared.” *Non lusisti satis*—“You have not played enough”; and so I was admonished before I began to speak that I was given but five minutes. I am curious to know how that time is to be reckoned for if we are to be governed by the College bell; there was once a time when the minutes ran into hours [Laughter and applause]—and there was no tintinnabulation in the bell [Laughter]. This was when my friend, Charlie Bartlett, who follows me, was in College [At this moment the great college bell rang out, amid

the laughter of the assembled multitude]. You see he has not been here long enough yet to stop it. I do not say it was a "*post*" or a "*propter*,"—I only speak of the silence of the bell.

But everybody knows, and if everybody does not know, they will know, that I am a small contingent from the Boston alumni. Twenty years ago, twenty men in Boston determined that the love of Dartmouth College should manifest itself by a positive exhibition of Dartmouth spirit [Applause]. The Dartmouth spirit meant that a Dartmouth man was as good as any other college man, and very often a little better. It meant that Dartmouth men were to stand together not for their own personal advantage, but to be a bulwark to the College; and in the twenty years the twenty men have squared to four hundred men, and will soon cube them [Applause].

I have in my pocket an original letter, which I am to present to the librarian of the College to-morrow, written by Mr. Webster immediately after the decision of the famous Dartmouth College Case, dated in 1819; this letter was written to his associate, Mr. Joseph Hopkinson at Philadelphia, and in it he made this remarkable prophecy. He said to Mr. Hopkinson,—“ Our College cause will be known to our children’s children. Let us take care that the rogues are not ashamed of their grandfathers.” We, my fellow alumni, are the children’s children. You are the rogues [Laughter] and we are not ashamed of our grandfathers. When Mr. Webster graduated there were ten men from Massachusetts in his class. To-day Massachusetts sends to this College three times as

many men as there were in the whole College a hundred years ago [Applause]; but in the words of our Boston transparency,—“ I shall enter on no encomium upon Massachusetts. There she is—behold her, and judge for yourselves.”

Far out at sea, beyond the gates of Boston Harbor, by an act of Congress, the Lighthouse Board has lately anchored a new light-ship. There the hardy pilots, coasting to meet the trans-Atlantic liner or the tall ships from Southern Seas, are ordered to keep it in sight by day and its twin lights by night.

So it comes to me, looking back over the gap of a hundred years upon the memory, the character, and the public services of Daniel Webster that somehow he has been placed for us in the troublous sea of worldly struggle where each waits and waits for his token of success, as our college lightship, showing ever and always these two unobscured lights, these two principles of our college brotherhood,—the one, that the alumni is not a league of classes, but a great body in which we all are co-ordinate, equal members,—and the other, an abiding, persistent, sacrificial love for dear old Dartmouth College [Great applause].

President Tucker then said: “That is so good we must have some more of the same kind, and I now call upon Charlie Bartlett, who will continue the story.”

Speech of Charles William Bartlett, Esquire, '69.

I do not, Mr. President and Trustees, intend to remove any more of my rig, I must retain my Daniel Webster tile [Laughter and applause]. In front, emblazoned on the hat, are the figures 1869. I was of that

vintage [Laughter]. For four long and somewhat active years I enjoyed the life at Dartmouth—some intermissions—and among the pleasant recollections that I have is that of the long years' attendance at the church on the corner, and careful remembrance of the texts [Laughter] from which the sermons were preached. To-day I went again. I heard Professor John K. Lord, Johnnie Lord, as we used to call him, for he was in the class of '68, and, will you believe it, he hazed me [Applause and laughter and cheers for Johnnie]. Once—never after [Laughter and applause]. I listened with delight to the able and eloquent address that he delivered there this afternoon. I listened to the various changes that he depicted; that such and such years changes were made here at Dartmouth. When he finished he ended with a quotation from some strange language [Laughter], Latin I have since been told. I have been endeavoring to find out ever since when it was that they changed the pronunciation; I was unable to follow that part of his address [Laughter]. I should dislike now—undergraduates I am talking to—to sit down and read my diploma in the original and read it in that way. I am afraid I should hardly recognize it. I followed the address with a great deal of pleasure when he referred to the year 1869, the one hundredth class, gentlemen, the centennial class. I had the honor at that time to be Marshal and I know that Professor Lord's address must be absolutely correct for I remember that rain. I remember what a sight it was to me standing in the rear of about fifteen hundred alumni of Dartmouth College sitting there, and, most astonishing fact of all, they followed the old rule, bald-headed fellows in

the front row [Laughter]. I have looked back a great many times to that celebration because to me, as a youngster, it was a great honor to lead that procession and to be followed directly, as we formed it at that time, by Chief Justice Chase, a graduate of this College, and General William T. Sherman. Now, coming down a little further, my brother Adams, whom I always assisted—he was in the class of '71—I always counselled with good advice his class when it was in trouble—has referred to an incident in which he said that “the College clock was silent—there was no ringing, and there was no such thing as the tolling of the bell.” He is mistaken. That bell was tolled by a stalwart man with a hammer, but he never left the hammer in the belfry [Laughter].

Now, referring again to texts. There is a little text that has occurred to me, coming from a song dear to every Dartmouth man; it comes directly from that song :

“The world will never have to call

On Dartmouth men in vain,”

and on that text I could, if permitted, deliver an oration. But Professor Smith sent me formal notice that under no circumstances should I be permitted over five minutes, and with that time limitation I must be content. I might say that when Dartmouth called on Daniel Webster in the years gone by, she did not call in vain. The world did not call in vain upon other occasions, as the orators of this celebration will elaborately tell you to-morrow. The same spirit led Daniel Webster under circumstances where his ability could be shown and his love to the old College

could be shown, to respond as only a Dartmouth man could respond. I have the abiding faith and belief that that spirit still lives and that, whenever the opportunity comes, whenever Dartmouth College calls, she never will call in vain on the boys that I see before me and the boys that I knew when I occupied the same position that you do [Applause]. I grieve to say that my five minutes is up [Applause].

President Tucker: "Gentlemen, it is hard for Boston to believe that it is not to-day what it has been as the Dartmouth Center. The center of gravity is moving westward, and is now pretty near Chicago. I have the honor of introducing to you the representative of the Chicago alumni, Professor Bradley."

Speech of Professor Charles Frederick Bradley, '73.

Walt Whitman said, "I love to study the Old Masters. Oh! that the Old Masters might come and study me!" I should like to adopt his formula and say, "We men of Dartmouth love to study Daniel Webster. Oh! that Daniel Webster might come to-night and study us." I believe he would find much to interest him. I am sure he never saw such a procession as has passed before this reviewing stand to-night, and I am sure that a procession at Dartmouth is peculiarly suggestive to every alumnus returning to the College. It reminds me in the first place of a very different procession in honor of a very different Daniel. I think there must be a good many here who remember Daniel Pratt, the "Great American Traveler," and some of you doubtless helped to arrange a procession which escorted him from the old Dartmouth Hotel to Dartmouth Chapel, where they con-

ferred upon him with all solemnity the honorary degree of C. O. D. [Great laughter]. He then delivered a very remarkable oration upon the subject of the *Vocabulaboratory* of the world's history [Great laughter]. After the address was over as he came out on the Chapel steps, some disturbance was caused, and brave man and chevalier though he was, he became frightened and started across the campus like a deer with the whole college in full cry after him. The speakers to-night trust they will not be treated in the same way [Laughter].

I think, speaking of "*vocabulaboratories*" that there is an incident related of Daniel Webster which was not referred to by Professor Richardson this afternoon, and is not likely to be given by Mr. McCall to-morrow. It is said that a great admirer of Mr. Webster consulted a spiritualistic medium and the spirit of Webster was called up. This admirer was very anxious to know what Mr. Webster's feelings were regarding the speech of the seventh of March, and asked, "Will Mr. Webster tell what in his life he most deeply regrets?" and the answer given through the medium was, "My greatest regret is that I did not live to revise my Dictionary again" [Applause and laughter]. Whatever other trouble there was connected with Daniel Webster there surely was no trouble with his vocabulary.

There are other processions of which I am reminded to-night, especially by these white-robed Seniors. These were night processions, too, and I shall never forget my sensations as a Freshman, when following in one of these to the sound of college horns, we passed through a resounding corridor of Dartmouth Hall whose historic and felicitous name I shall not mention here, where,

amid the din of the horns and the resounding of the hoofs, it seemed, indeed, as if pandemonium had been let loose. Then there were also the processions of Class Day, when the departing Senior is wondering how the college world can exist *without* him, a question to be followed, alas! often within a very few days, with another as to what the outside world can possibly do *with* him [Laughter].

And then there is that procession which certainly has stirred the heart of every Dartmouth man, the first Commencement procession in which he ever took part. How proudly as Freshman he followed the band, conscious that at last he was in his proper place at the head of the procession. But what disappointment he suffered when at the Church doors he saw the procession halt and divide, and then like the anaconda boa constrictor "swallow itself and crawl through itself" leaving him at the end.

But the procession at Dartmouth, so wonderfully presented to us to-night, is also suggestive, I think, to every one of us of the whole procession of Dartmouth men who are marching on,—the living and the dead,—a procession of men, and a procession of manly men. A procession of brothers in a large sense. I do not say there are not other colleges, and many other colleges, where there is a brotherly spirit, but I do say there are some institutions which could not be called so much *Alma Maters*; so mechanical are they, so enormous their numbers, so lacking in the friendly and brotherly and motherly spirit that they are rather *Alma Incubators* [Laughter and applause]. We are brothers,—a thought dear to all Dartmouth men,—whether they are of our class or not.

whether they are of our time or not. I say it advisedly, that when I returned after twenty-five years to our class reunion it was one of the revelations of my life that I knew so intimately every member of the class who returned, and that we seemed to bear a relation to each other that was unlike any other in our experience. Dartmouth men, in a very noble and very beautiful sense, are all brothers, the world over. And hence it is that we so delight to honor those who are the great among us. Their glory is reflected upon us, their glory and their greatness inspires us.

And so we are called upon, as Dartmouth men celebrating this hundredth anniversary of the graduation of Dartmouth's most illustrious son, to be worthy brothers of Daniel Webster, to remember how he represented patriotism and statesmanship. None can rival him, none can equal his matchless oratory, none can command the amazing forces of his colossal intellect, but we can all be patriots. We can all re-consecrate ourselves to the country he loved, and so gloriously gave his life to, most fittingly at this time, in the shadow of the great national affliction which has befallen us, and just as a young man enters upon the Presidency of our nation who represents in an extraordinary degree, as no President ever did before, the idea of the university man devoting himself unselfishly to practical politics. As Dartmouth men we may not only put on the outward clothes that were so dignified in Daniel Webster [and so dignify these gentlemen of the alumni], but we may clothe ourselves in the civic virtues for which he was distinguished. In that great procession I call upon you,

gentlemen, to give three cheers for three great brothers of Dartmouth—Eleazar Wheelock, the great, wise, heroic founder ; Daniel Webster, the illustrious statesman and matchless orator and re-founder ; and William Jewett Tucker, the ideal president and great extender [Great applause followed by three cheers].

Program.

A procession made up of trustees with invited guests, faculty, alumni and students formed in the College Yard at 9.30 o'clock, and marched to the College Church.

Processional—"Coronation March from The Prophet."

Meyerbeer

Salem Cadet Band.

Chorus—"Sanctus in E flat."

Osgood

Prayer by the Reverend Arthur Little, D.D., '60, of Dorchester, Massachusetts.

Chorus—"Prayer of Thanksgiving." *Old Netherlands* (1626)

Address by the President of the College.

Oration by the Honorable Samuel Walker McCall, '74, of Massachusetts.

Chorus—"Ein Feste Burg."

Old German

Conferring of Honorary Degrees.

The singing by the chorus and congregation of Milton's paraphrase of Psalm CXXXVI.

Benediction by the Reverend Arthur Little, D.D.

Introductory Address

By the President of the College.

THE observance of the Centennial of Mr. Webster's graduation from College is an academic event of its own kind. I am not aware of an instance in which a college has taken note in a formal way of the graduation of any of its alumni. The motive which has led us to observe this event is so natural and evident, that our action invites, I think, neither criticism

nor imitation. We have not sought to introduce a custom. No college or university may see fit to celebrate a like event in its history. We may have no occasion to repeat these observances under other conditions.

The relation of Mr. Webster to his College, his living and his posthumous relation, is unique. It is doubtful if the name of any educational institution in the land is so inseparably blended with the name of a graduate, or even of a founder, as is the name of Dartmouth with that of Daniel Webster. The story of the founding of this College by Eleazar Wheelock is a romance, the great educational romance of the eighteenth century. The story of its "re-founding" by Daniel Webster is written in law, the law of the land since 1820. Had Mr. Webster died immediately after the Dartmouth College decision he would have left the College imbedded in the national life. The after years of his personal fame were of almost equal service to the College. His reputation, his influence, his memory became a part of our institutional assets. We cannot tell to-day whether we owe more to Mr. Webster for what he did or for what he was.

And yet in this relation of Mr. Webster to the College, unique as it is, there is nothing unnatural or exaggerated. He belongs to us because he was one of us. There was nothing to set him apart or separate him, except size. He was "to the manor born." A New Hampshire boy, he never thought of entering any other college than Dartmouth. And once here he found all that he needed at that stage of his development. The Dartmouth of Mr. Webster's time was quite abreast of the still older colleges with which it is associated.

During the decade which included the greater part of his collegiate course, Dartmouth graduated three hundred and sixty-three men, Harvard three hundred and ninety-four, Yale two hundred and ninety-five, and Princeton two hundred and forty. Mr. Webster referred in his argument to Dartmouth as a "small college." It was a small college, but not small as related to its neighbors, nor insufficient as related to its work. It gave Mr. Webster what he was capable of receiving in the way of instruction, stimulus and opportunity. And when the time came for him to repay his debt to the College he simply did his duty. He did no more than he ought to have done, no more than any graduate ought to do for his college with a like opportunity before him and with equal resources at his command. It was natural, too, that he should continue to love his college to the end, and rejoice that he was a part of it, as natural as was his love of kindred and of nature. I dwell upon the simplicity and constancy of Mr. Webster's feeling toward the College, because these qualities explain so largely our feeling toward him. His loyalty was commensurate with his power of service, his affection was as deep as his nature.

We, therefore, who are reaping the fruits of his devotion, have taken the earliest opportunity, that afforded by the centennial of his graduation, to express our gratitude and pride. The first suggestion of the present observance, so far as I know, certainly anticipating my own thought, came from a class-mate, Mr. David H. Brown of Boston. I soon found, however, that the thought was in many minds, and the feeling in many hearts. The sentiment obtained everywhere

among the alumni that there should be some appropriate recognition of the anniversary of Mr. Webster's graduation. At a meeting of the trustees, held on January nineteenth, 1900, it was decided to take definite action as indicated by the following resolution :

"In view of the fact that the Commencement of 1901 will be the one hundredth anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster, whose supreme service to the College in recovering and re-establishing its chartered rights calls for recognition on the part of the sons of Dartmouth :

"Be it voted that the centennial of Mr. Webster's graduation be observed as an academic occasion at Hanover, at such time in the year 1901 and in such manner as may be appropriate, to be participated in by the faculty, students, alumni, and friends of the College."

In accordance with the terms of this resolution the commemoration which is now taking place is personal and institutional rather than academic in its broad sense. We have not asked other colleges and the universities to join with us in this celebration. We did not wish, as I have said, to seem to inaugurate an academic custom, neither did we wish to prejudice an observance by the College some years hence of a strictly academic event or combination of events. The year 1919 will be the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the charter of the College, and the one hundredth anniversary of the decision in the Dartmouth College Case. We leave to our successors the honor of observing that year as a great academic occasion. Whatever the present occasion may lack, however, on the academic

side is more than met by its significance as a civil event. This celebration opens to us not only Mr. Webster's college life and his argument for the College, but his whole career. We have asked the presence of the State at this time in the person of His Excellency, the Governor of New Hampshire, and of his Councilors and Staff, in the person of the members of the Judiciary, and of the representatives of the Legislature. We have sought the informal co-operation of the neighboring State in which so much of Mr. Webster's professional and political life was passed, and we are honored by the gracious response of the senior Senator from Massachusetts. We have invited the recognition of the Government at Washington, and its august representative is with us in the person of the Chief Justice of the United States.

It may be pardonable to add to this word of explanation the reminder of the fact that as we celebrate this past event we find ourselves in the presence of a living personality. No man of his time has borne the gradual transfer from memory to tradition with so little loss. No name out of his time is so familiar to-day as his name. Mr. Webster was never loved by the people at large as some men have been loved. Popular affection as it went out toward him grew hesitant in the approach and became awed in his presence. It did not quite dare that passionate fondness which some men allow in their success; it did not dare that compassionate tenderness which some men would welcome, which he might have welcomed, in decline and defeat. But in one respect the personal influence of Mr. Webster surpassed and continues to surpass that of all other men,

namely, in his influence over the ambitions of young men. During his life-time Mr. Beecher had many imitators. Mr. Webster's power was deeper, more searching, more creative. It touched the center and core of personal ambition, stirring young men to make the most of themselves and to act with most effect upon others. Mr. Webster has been and still is a potent influence in sending men to college, into the law, and into politics.

Measured in broader terms his influence is vital to-day in the thought and feelings of men in respect to the country. We have learned, we have begun to learn, to think about the country in his terms, and to feel about it as he felt. His conceptions were so great that they could find room only in his own mind. They belong to the United States of to-day, not to the nation of his time. Thus far Mr. Webster is the only man who has comprehended the American people. Until a greater American than he shall arise, he will live in the still unfulfilled destiny of the Republic.

Webster Centennial Oration.

*By the Honorable Samuel Walker McCall, '74, of
Massachusetts.*

President Tucker, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

EARLY half a century has elapsed since the College gave formal expression to its sorrow at the death of Daniel Webster. The life of that great statesman had just ended. On this very spot Rufus Choate spoke his eulogy. Sympathy in a common political cause and the attachment of a life-long friendship stimulated an almost unrivaled gift of eloquence to the production of a masterpiece among orations of that na-

ture, a speech of which Mr. Everett expressed the opinion that it was "as magnificent a eulogium as was ever pronounced." It was a time for the eulogy of friends, and for the expression of a sense of desolateness over the departure of so transcendent a figure, but it was no time for a just estimate of Webster either as a man or a statesman. His career had been too great to be comprehended by a near view. It demanded that perspective without which only a distorted outline of vast objects can be obtained. The passion of partisanship was hot and surging. Above the deep tones of praise arose the sharp clamor of detraction. Across the horizon which shut out the near future could be heard the beating of the drums which he had set throbbing for the Union. The chief work of his life was yet to be tried in the furnace of civil war. It required that most inexorable of all tests—the test of time.

Transient movements and the mere noises of unsubstantial reputations have had time to pass into the silence of oblivion. A generation that knew him not has come upon the scene. We can now see something of the proper and ultimate relations of events. We are now able somewhat dispassionately to judge. The observance, amid general approval, of this unique occasion bears its own eloquent tribute. That so many who occupy positions of responsibility and distinction, and to whom Webster is merely a historical personage, should come here to-day, as to a shrine, from all parts of the country, fifty years after he has disappeared from the view of men, is of striking significance. The loadstone that draws you is his fame. Obviously the stupendous events of that half century have not dwarfed him. The

distance at which most of us disappear hardly serves to bring out his heroic proportions, and we are here to-day to do homage to a statesman who easily takes rank as the foremost figure in our parliamentary history.

The task of fully reviewing his career goes far beyond the limits of this occasion. I shall endeavor to set before you some estimate of him as a lawyer, an orator, and a statesman, and shall recall to your minds some of the great principles of government with which he was identified. I shall ask you also to look at him for a moment in the supreme relation in which he stood to his fellow men; for back of the orator, or statesman, or lawyer there stands the essential thing that is manifested in them, there stands the man.

And I should fail to perform the most obvious duty if I did not refer to his relations to the College which helped to nurture his genius and towards which he bore a filial love. When he entered the College more than one hundred years ago it had attained a considerable degree of prosperity. For a quarter of a century after Wheelock planted it in the wilderness it remained the only college in northern New England, and the rapid settlement of the country about it gave it a constituency respectable in numbers and still more respectable in character. Webster came from one of the frontier families that crowded into this region. When the smoke first curled from the chimney of his father's log cabin in Salisbury, there was, as the son has said, "no similar evidence of a white man's habitation between it and the settlements on the rivers of Canada." Professor Wendell tells us in his scholarly book on American literature that Webster was the "son of a New Hampshire coun-

tryman," and again, that " he retained so many traces of his far from eminent New Hampshire origin " that he was less typical of the Boston orators than were some other men. It is true that the father was a "New Hampshire countryman," and he does not appear to have attained any remarkable eminence. But only the most cautious inference should be drawn from a surface or negative fact of that character, in a past necessarily covered for the most part with darkness. A great deal is to-day unknown about that sturdy race of men who swarmed over our frontiers more than a century ago, and especially a great deal that was worthy and noble in individuals. And it is hardly useful to turn to a doubtful past in order to learn of a known present, or to judge of a son whom we know well from a father of whom we know but little. It is often more safe to judge of the ancestor from the descendant than of the descendant from the ancestor. I supposed that Daniel Webster had forever settled the essential character of the stock from which he sprung, just as the pure gold of Lincoln's character unerringly points to a mine of unalloyed metal somewhere, if there is anything in the principles of heredity ; and whether the mine is known or unknown, its gold will pass current even at the Boston mint. Perhaps neither of these men in himself or in his origin was wholly typical of any place, but it is enough that they were typical of America. But what we know of Webster's father indicates the origin of some of the great qualities of the son. He was a man of much native strength of intellect and of resolute independence of character. He was an officer in the Revolutionary army, and, although never trained to the law, was thought fit

to be appointed to a judicial office of considerable importance. He had those magnificent physical qualities which made the son a source of wonder to all who knew him. He had, too, a heart which, the son once said, "he seemed to have borrowed from a lion." "Your face is not so black, Daniel," Stark once said "as your father's was with gunpowder at the Bennington fight." And on the night after the discovery of Arnold's treason, at that dark moment when even the faithful might be thought faithless, and the safety of the new nation demanded a sure arm to lean upon, it was then, according to the tradition, that Webster was put in command of the guard before the headquarters of our general, and George Washington, another "countryman," said, "Captain Webster, I believe I can trust *you*."

I have alluded to the prosperity which the College soon attained on account of the rapid settlement of this region. During the ten years immediately preceding the year of Webster's graduation it was second among the colleges of the country in the number of graduates to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. But whatever may have been its relative rank the one thing most certainly known about it now is that it was a small college. The pathetic statement of Webster in the argument of its cause at the bar of the Supreme Court has settled that fact for all time. It is true that it was a day of small things, but the smallness of contemporary objects was not immortalized by the touch of genius, which has it in its power to endow with perpetual life any passing condition or mood in the life of a man or an institution. Fifty generations have grown old and died since the Greek artist carved his marble urn, but the maiden and

her lover chiselled there are still young, and to the immortality conferred by art has been added the immortality of poetry in the noble verse of Keats: "Forever wilt thou love and she be fair."

The College has grown wonderfully in the century since Webster left her. It is our hope that the prosperity of her past may be eclipsed by the prosperity of her future. But however great she may become hereafter, the genius of her son has made it impossible to be forgotten that she was once a small college.

The schooling of Webster before he entered college was of a very limited character. He appears to have been well drilled in Latin, but he possessed only the rudiments of English, and of Greek he knew very little. It must not be overlooked, however, that even at his early age he had acquired a fondness for the *Spectator* and for other good English books. While in college he broadened his reading of English and history until he was said to be at the head of his class in those branches. Perhaps his most positive acquirement was in the Latin language, in which he became a good scholar and which he continued to study in after life. A profound knowledge of a foreign tongue can hardly be conclusively inferred from frequent quotations from it. In the oratory of the first half of the last century the Latin quotation was an established institution, and for much of it little more than the manual custody of the Latin author was apparently necessary. But the quotations from that language in Webster's speeches were apt and usually betrayed an insight into the meaning of the author, deep enough often to get a second or poetical meaning. He continued to neglect Greek, probably because he had

been so miserably prepared in it, and long afterwards he lamented that he had not studied it until he could read and understand Demosthenes in his own tongue. The course of study which he followed was the rigid and unyielding course of that day, where every branch was impartially prescribed for everybody. Mr. Ticknor is authority for the statement that the instruction in the College was meagre. This appears to have been a fault of the times rather than a particular fault of the College; for a dozen years after Webster's graduation, and in Boston, Mr. Ticknor himself succeeded in getting the necessary books to study German only with the greatest difficulty. He discovered a text-book in the Boston Athenaeum which appears to have been so much of a curiosity that it was deposited there by John Quincy Adams on going abroad; and then he was forced to send to New Hampshire for a dictionary. But however narrow the course of study compared with that of the modern college, it contained the means of much excellent discipline and the years spent in its pursuit laid the foundation of a broad culture and prepared the way for the development of thinkers and scholars. The debating society was an institution to which Webster was devoted and from which he derived great benefit. It enabled him to overcome his timidity which had been so great at Exeter that it was impossible for him to recite his declamations before the school, and he became in college a ready and self-possessed debater. I do not find it easy, however, to detect under the flowers of his early rhetoric the promise of that weighty and concentrated style which afterwards distinguished him. But his college efforts were a necessary part of his intellectual de-

velopment. It was better that the inborn desire to utter fine words without meaning should be satisfied in youth, when it could be satisfied with comparative safety, than that it should be restrained at the risk of gratification when he came to perform the sober duties of life. Although not the first in scholarship he undoubtedly acquired a leadership among his college mates. His popularity was the natural result of the display of his ability and manly qualities in that most just and perfect democracy in the world—a democracy of schoolboys. It lingered in the College after he left it; and when he returned after his graduation with the “shekels,” as he expressed it, which he had earned for his brother Ezekiel, he was received as quite a hero.

It is difficult to believe, in view of the majestic proportions of his later years, that he was ever slender and delicate, but he is spoken of as being in his college days “long, slender, pale and all eyes.” But his slight form supported an enormous mass of head, with its noble brow crowned by hair as black as the wing of a raven. Undoubtedly his most striking features were those wonderful black eyes, which near the end of his life Carlyle spoke of as “dull anthracite furnaces, needing only to be blown,” but which were then lighted up with the fire and brilliancy of youth. His nature unfolded itself slowly. Far from being forward it required a strong effort for him to overcome his bashfulness. He displayed while in college the qualities of a large, undeveloped nature and led a careless, happy and somewhat indolent existence.

There was that in his appearance at that early day which arrested attention and dispensed with the neces-

sity of the ordinary introduction. Soon after leaving college he entered the law office of the accomplished Christopher Gore of Boston, presented by one as unknown as himself, who could not or did not speak his name,—under circumstances surely that would not ordinarily secure a hearing, much less employment of a confidential character, but the attention of the busy lawyer and man of the world was at once secured and Webster was told to go to work. His connection with Gore proved of great value, not so much because it gave him an opportunity to study his profession, under as favorable conditions probably as then existed, but because Gore's advice deterred him from taking a step which might have kept him from his great career. Webster was offered the clerkship of a New Hampshire court with a salary which, in his circumstances, was a tempting one, and he had no other thought than to accept it. Gore clearly saw that he was capable of performing a far higher part in the world, and he doubtless saw, too, the danger that the competency which the place offered might tempt him from making the hard struggle necessary to establish himself at the bar. He strongly urged Webster to decline the position and thus rendered him a great service in keeping him upon the arduous road. It was a fortunate circumstance, too, in his early career that it fell to his lot to meet often in the courts so great a lawyer as Jeremiah Mason. When Webster came to the Portsmouth bar he found Mason its unquestioned leader. Mason was a giant mentally and physically, thoroughly trained in his profession, with an absolute contempt for rhetorical ornament, and a way of talking directly at juries in a terse and informal

style which they could comprehend, standing, as Webster expressed it, so that he might put his finger on the foreman's nose. Long afterwards, when Webster's fame as a lawyer and statesman extended over the whole country, he wrote it as his deliberate opinion of Mason that if there was a stronger intellect in the country he did not know it. From this estimate he would not even except John Marshall. Webster quickly outstripped his other rivals, and for nine years he maintained the struggle against this formidable antagonist for supremacy at the Portsmouth bar. He was compelled to overcome his natural tendency to indolence and to make the most careful preparation of his cases. The rivalry called into play the most strenuous exercise of all his faculties. The intellectual vigilance and readiness which became his marked characteristics in debate were especially cultivated. He soon saw the futility of florid declamation against the simple style of Mason, and his own eloquence rapidly passed out of the efflorescent stage and became direct and full of the Saxon quality, although he never affected little words and would use a strong word of Latin origin when it would answer his purpose. When his practice at the Portsmouth bar came to an end he had proved his ability to contend on even terms, at least, with Mason, and he had developed those great qualities which enabled him to take his place as the leader of the Boston bar, almost without a struggle, and to step at an early age into the front rank of the lawyers who contended in the Supreme Court at Washington.

This occasion demands more than a passing reference to the cause in which Webster gained a recognized

place among the leaders of the bar of the national Supreme Court, for it possesses a double importance to us to-day. It marked an epoch in his professional career and it vitally concerned the existence of this College. The Dartmouth College causes grew out of enactments of the New Hampshire legislature, making amendments in the charter which differed little from repeal. These acts did not spring primarily from a desire to improve the charter, but were the outgrowth of a division in the board of trustees, one of the parties endeavoring to secure by legislation the control which it had lost in the board itself. In substance the legislative acts created a new corporation and transferred to it all the property of the College. There would have been little security in the charters of colleges or of similar establishments in this country if state legislatures generally had possessed the power to pass acts of that sweeping character. The trustees made a struggle for self-preservation against great odds. The dominant political forces in the state were hostile; the legislature was against them; and, as it turned out, the Supreme Court of the state was against them also. The contest was first made in the state court, and it is rare that there has ever been brought together in a trial in any court such an array of lawyers as appeared in the little courtroom at Exeter. Webster appeared for the College. He had with him Jeremiah Mason and Jeremiah Smith. Webster and Mason formed a combination which could not be surpassed in strength by that of any other two lawyers at the American bar, while Smith, the former chief justice of the state, was probably its most learned lawyer. It is no disparagement of the counsel against

the College to say that they were overmatched. They were, however, great lawyers, Sullivan the attorney-general, and Ichabod Bartlett, a hard fighter and an ingenious and eloquent advocate. Both sides were fully prepared in the state court, and it may well be doubted whether New Hampshire has ever witnessed such another intellectual contest as took place at Exeter over the College charter. Webster's speech does not appear in the printed report of the proceedings in the state court. He was the only one of the counsel on either side in the New Hampshire court who took part at Washington, and he apparently did not wish to be reported twice in the same cause. But at Exeter he closed for his side in a speech of great brilliancy; and his "Cæsar in the Senate House" peroration, which is said to have brought tears to the eyes of John Marshall at Washington, was spoken in substance and with thrilling effect. The decision of the New Hampshire court was against the College and disposed of the point which appeared to be the strongest in its case, that the legislature was inherently incapable of passing the acts in question because vested rights could not be taken away without a judgment which could be rendered only by the judiciary. It also settled the claim that the statutes in question were in contravention of the constitution of New Hampshire. The simple ground of appeal to the federal Supreme Court lay in the contention that the College charter was a contract and was under the protection of that clause of the federal constitution which prohibited states from passing laws impairing the obligation of contracts. Webster did indeed state the whole argument before the court at Washington, but only for the pur-

pose of illustration and very likely also for collateral effect upon the court.

The point upon which the court had jurisdiction was regarded by the College counsel as a forlorn hope and to be more daring and novel than sound. It apparently originated with Mason. It was, however, the only ground open on the appeal, and this was a fortunate circumstance for the fame of the cause. If the whole cause had been subject to review it might well have been decided upon one of the other grounds, and thus it would not have become one of the great landmarks of constitutional law. Wirt, who was then the attorney-general of the United States, and Holmes appeared at Washington against the College, and Hopkinson with Webster in its favor. It must be admitted that Webster possessed an advantage over the other counsel. He had fought over the ground, when it was most stubbornly contested, and knew every inch of it. His whole soul was in his case. He had the briefs of Mason and Smith as well as his own and had absorbed every point in all the great arguments on his side at Exeter. He generously gave all the credit to Smith and Mason. He was interested in preventing the printing of the Exeter speeches because, he said, it would show where he got his plumes. This was undoubtedly too generous, but his debt was a great one, and no lawyer was ever better prepared than Webster was when he rose to speak in the College cause. He possessed too as great a mastery of his opponents' arguments as of his own. With his extraordinary power of eloquence thus armed it is not strange that the court was to witness a revelation and that he was

destined to a great personal triumph. He took the part of junior counsel and opened the argument, but when he took his seat after five hours of high reason and clear statement, kindled with tremendous passion and delivered with all the force of his wonderful personality, the case had been both opened and closed and nothing remained to be said. The spectators were astonished and overawed. It is not to be wondered at that Marshall sat enchained and that Story forgot to take notes. The counsel against the College were far from being so well prepared. Webster afterwards wrote a letter to Wirt complimenting him upon his argument and Wirt apparently satisfied himself; but the tremendous performance by Webster took his antagonists by surprise. The personal triumph of the latter was complete and it was followed by the triumph of his cause. The argument won over Story, who had been counted on by the opponents of the College, as the reading of it afterwards won over Chancellor Kent, who had at first approved the decision of the New Hampshire court. A majority of the court was carried, and carried probably by the eloquence of the advocate; the College was saved, and at the same time there was witnessed the birth of a great principle of constitutional law and of a great national fame.

There have been arguments before the same high tribunal more discursively eloquent, more witty, and delivered with a greater parade of learning; but in the boldness, novelty, and far reaching character of the propositions advanced, in the strength with which they were maintained, in the judgment with which the points of argument were selected and the skill with which

they were pressed upon the court, in the natural oratorical passion, so consuming that for five hours the spectators were held spellbound by a discussion of questions of law, no greater speech was ever made before the Supreme Court. No other advocate in that tribunal ever equalled what he himself never surpassed. The published report of this speech is apparently much condensed and contains only the outlines of what was said. There is no hint of the beautiful peroration. Mr. Ticknor says of the printed version that those who heard him when the speech was delivered "still wonder how such dry bones could ever have lived with the power they there witnessed and felt." But even the printed version is a classic in its severe simplicity and beauty. Although this was not the first cause argued by Webster before the national high court, it especially marked the beginning of a career which continued for more than a third of a century and stamps him on the whole as the greatest figure who ever appeared at that august bar.

And here at this first high point in his professional career it may be appropriate to take a view of him as an advocate and a lawyer. His greater fame doubtless was won as a statesman and political orator because it was won in a broader forum, but to him belongs the rare distinction of pre-eminence in Congress and the courts. It is sometimes said that there is an incompatibility in the qualities that make a great advocate and a great parliamentary orator. Certainly there are instances of men who were highly successful in one capacity and who failed in the other. But such instances will usually be found where eminence was gained in one career, and mental habits adjusted to its demands before

the other began. Webster entered upon his double career early in life and his development in each branch of it contributed to his development in the other. He had scarcely become established at the bar before he engaged in the public service and he pursued both careers concurrently during the remainder of his life. His efforts at the bar made him more definite and accurate in the Senate and his experience as a statesman broadened him as a lawyer. His qualities became equally commanding in both fields.

He was doubtless excelled in some departments of his profession by other lawyers; Curtis was more deeply versed in the law; Choate surpassed him, as, indeed, he surpassed all others in the constant brilliancy of his advocacy before juries, although Webster made one speech to a jury which Choate never equalled. But I think it can be said without exaggeration that, more nearly than any other, Webster filled the large circle of requirements for that high place, and that he stands at the head of the whole American bar.

He has often been contrasted with William Pinckney, I suppose because the latter during the first thirty years of the court's history was the most conspicuous figure at its bar. They were never fairly measured directly against each other. Webster came prominently into view just as Pinckney's sun was setting. When he argued the Dartmouth College Case he was only thirty-six years old and had had barely a dozen years of practice, most of it in a small New Hampshire town where the causes were neither numerous nor important. Although he would not suffer by the comparison it would be obviously unfair to take him at this comparatively

immature period and place him by the side of a seasoned veteran like Pinckney, who was seventeen years his senior, and who possessed the great prestige and development which came from having worthily filled the most important offices of the government, and from his great practice before the Supreme Court, at the bar of which he was the acknowledged leader. A fairer comparison would be between Pinckney at the summit of his fame, when he attempted to press for a re-argument of the College cause and John Marshall turned his "blind eye" towards him, and Webster at the same age and period of his career, after he had argued that long line of important constitutional causes, had delivered the Bunker Hill oration and the reply to Hayne, had become known abroad and his own country rung with his fame, and when he stood the unchallenged leader of a far larger, if not a greater, bar. Pinckney was a great and learned lawyer, a brilliant orator and capable of close and abstract reasoning. But his style was often balanced and artificial, disfigured by affectation, and contained much diffuse declamation. Its faults as well as its merits may be strikingly seen in the famous argument in the *Nereide* case, of which John Marshall said in the opinion of the court, "With a pencil dipped in the most vivid colors and guided by the hand of a master a splendid portrait has been drawn." It will appear from the very full report of that argument which survives that the father of American jurisprudence was hardly so safe a judge of literary coloring as of law. As to Webster's art, if as an advocate he can be credited with art, it was so concealed that the chief justice was not called upon consciously to exercise his faculties as

a judge of coloring. Take Pinckney's greatest efforts at the bar, in the Senate, or in diplomacy, and compare them with corresponding efforts of Webster and I believe the superiority of the latter will be distinctly seen.

It is sometimes said of Webster that he was not learned in the law. But in the very best sense of the term he was a learned lawyer. If his mind was not an encyclopedia of cases it was a storehouse of legal principles. He was not the man to make a pedantic parade and to obscure the essential point under a great mass of quotations from cases. He did not have the habit of irrelevant citation, nor did he throw upon the court the burden of winnowing a little wheat from an enormous quantity of chaff. He had the art of condensation and would select the genuine points of his case and put them with unsurpassed simplicity and weight. He possessed to a remarkable degree, too, the inborn legal sense without which there can be no lawyer. From the day when, a mere stripling, he graduated from this College, the law was his chief study. The necessities of his great practice imposed it upon him. Usually acting as senior counsel in important cases, he had the advantage of the preparation of learned juniors. He was called upon in court to display a mastery of his own side and to hear and meet all that could be said by great lawyers against it. His memory was prodigious. The result of it all was that with his great natural powers thus disciplined by forty years of practice, one would have been willing to back him, not merely as a parliamentary Hercules, as Carlyle said, but as a legal Hercules, against the whole extant world.

A great part of a lawyer's work is ephemeral and perishes with the day that brought it forth. Some of the miracles which Rufus Choate wrought in the courts were a nine days' wonder, passed into splendid traditions, and were then forgotten. This is due to the fact that while there are many causes of vast consequence to individuals there are comparatively few which are of importance to society generally or in the development of the law. But a great mass of Webster's legal work survives and ensures him a permanent fame as a lawyer. Take for instance the case of *Gibbons and Ogden*, where the State of New York had attempted to grant a monopoly of navigation on the waters under its jurisdiction. The doctrine which Webster contended for in that case was sustained by the court. In a time when so much is said of the evils of granting franchises in the public streets, we can appreciate the far-reaching importance of a decision which at one stroke forever rescued our great lakes and harbors and the Mississippi and the Ohio from the grasp of monopolies and left our inland waters open highways for all to navigate on equal terms. In the formative period of our institutions, when their limits were explored in the courts and established by judicial construction, there were great judges besides Marshall and great lawyers besides Webster. But Marshall stands in America unapproached as a jurist just as Webster stands as an advocate without a rival. The former set our constitutional landmarks and the latter pointed out where they should be placed. And it is significant of Webster's primacy that in important debates to-day, in Congress or elsewhere, upon great questions of a constitutional character or of a

political-legal character, relating to our systems of government and the nature and limitations of their powers, he is more widely quoted than any other lawyer, whether speaking only with his own voice or *ex cathedra* as a member of our highest court.

An important sphere of his professional activity would be neglected if I did not refer to his strength as an advocate before juries. The same simple style which enlightened the courts made him easily understood by the ordinary jurymen. But his oratory was less fettered by technical rules and was more varied before juries than before the courts. Only two of his very many speeches to juries are preserved in his published works and each of these amply demonstrates his enormous capacity in that field. I will refer to the speech delivered in the White murder case, because it has been pronounced by eminent lawyers, who are accustomed to measure their words, to be the greatest argument ever addressed to a jury. Certainly it is a masterpiece of eloquence. A rich old man had been found in his bed murdered. The murderer had been hired by two brothers to do the deed in the hope that one of them might profit from the old man's estate. "It was," said Webster, "a cool, calculating, money-making murder," a murder "for hire and salary, not revenge. It was the weighing of money against life, the counting of so many pieces of silver against so many ounces of blood." This is the description of the deed: "The assassin enters through the window already prepared, into an unoccupied apartment. With noiseless foot he paces the lonely hall, half lighted by the moon; he winds up the ascent of the stairs and reaches the door

of the chamber. Of this he moves the lock, by soft and continuous pressure, till it turns on its hinges without noise; and he enters, and beholds his victim before him. The room is uncommonly open to the admission of light. The face of the innocent sleeper is turned from the murderer, and the beams of the moon, resting on the grey locks of his aged temple, show him where to strike. The fatal blow is given! and the victim passes, without a struggle or a motion, from the repose of sleep to the repose of death. . . . To finish the picture, he explores the wrist for the pulse. He feels for it and ascertains that it beats no longer. It is accomplished. The deed is done. He retreats, retraces his steps to the window, passes out through it as he came in, and escapes. He has done the murder. No eye has seen him, no ear has heard him. The secret is his own, and it is safe. Ah! gentlemen, that was a dreadful mistake. Such a secret can be safe nowhere. The whole creation of God has neither nook nor corner where the guilty can bestow it and say it is safe." And then follows the wonderful passage on the power of conscience, which is almost as widely known as the peroration of the reply to Hayne. It is a striking circumstance that the most powerful part of this speech was upon a point where the fact was against Webster's position, although he may not have been aware of it. The fact however was an unnatural one, as facts sometimes are. The prisoner's counsel had urged that the prisoner's motive, in going to a place near the scene of the murder at the time it was committed, might have been curiosity and not that he might aid the murderer. "Curiosity," exclaimed Webster, "to witness the suc-

cess of the execution of his own plan of murder! The very walls of a court house ought not to stand, the ploughshare should run through the ground it stands on where such an argument could find toleration." Rufus Choate, who appears to have heard this speech and who was also a fine Greek scholar, declared it to be in his opinion "a more difficult and higher effort of mind than the Oration on the Crown."

But prominent as Webster was in the courts, his great fame rests upon his career as a political orator and a statesman. He was first elected to Congress in 1812 and from that time until his death, forty years afterwards, he was, with the exception of three short intervals, constantly in the public service. He was for ten years a representative in Congress, nineteen years a Senator, and five years Secretary of State. He possessed no meteoric qualities to startle and attract attention, but his commanding talents were certain of recognition the moment they were displayed upon a suitable field. Within one month from the time he first took his seat in the House he made a speech upon the Berlin and Milan decrees, which probed deeply into the causes of the war we were waging against Great Britain and which the duplicity of Napoleon's government had a considerable share in bringing about. John Marshall, to whom Webster was then a stranger, was so deeply impressed with the speech that he predicted that Webster would become "one of the very first statesmen in America, if not the very first." During his first Congress he easily took a place among the very limited number of public men of the first rank at Washington,

and he grew in strength and the public esteem until he had no peer among living American statesmen.

The chief source of his success as a statesman is found in his transcendent power of speech. When his public career began, a highly decorated fashion of oratory, which has been termed the Corinthian style, flourished in this country. Our orators were justly conscious of the fact that we had won our independence from the greatest power in the world and had become a nation. Everyone was inspired to talk eloquently about liberty and as a consequence a vast number of literary crimes were committed in her name. It was an excessively oratorical era. Whether the thought was great or little the grand manner was imperatively demanded. The contemporary accounts of the speeches of that time were as highly wrought as the speeches themselves and one would suppose that orators of the grade of Demosthenes existed in every considerable village; although it will be observed that they gradually diminished in number as the cold art of stenography became more commonly and successfully practiced. The simple art of speaking with reference to the exact truth was held in contempt, and the art of extravagant expression was carefully cultivated. It is not difficult to detect in this extravagance the influence of Edmund Burke. He was chiefly responsible, however, only because he stood in a class by himself and could defy successful imitation. There is nothing more gorgeous in English literature than the best of his speeches or essays, for his speeches and essays were the same sort of composition. His knowledge was varied and prodigious and even his conversation, well compared by Moore to a Roman triumph,

was enriched with the spoils of all learning. In depth and intensity of feeling and a noble sympathy for the oppressed of every race he was surpassed by no orator, ancient or modern. He had the glowing and exuberant imagination that

“Kicks at earth with a disdainful heel

And beats at Heaven gates with her bright hoofs.”

Imitation of Burke, thus royally endowed and blazing with indignation at some great public wrong, would easily lend itself to extravagance and produce the empty form of colossal speech without its substance. I think Burke's influence can be clearly seen in our orators from his own day to the end of Charles Sumner's time. A few of Webster's speeches show not merely the inspiration due to an appreciative understanding of Burke, which was legitimate and might be wholesome, but a somewhat close and dispiriting imitation of Burke's manner. This is true particularly of the much admired Plymouth oration, which substituted John Adams for the Lord Bathurst of Burke's celebrated passage, and extorted from that venerable patriot, who had come under the spell of the Corinthian era, the statement that Burke could no longer be called the most consummate orator of modern times. But it is Webster's glory that at his best he had a style that was all his own, simple, massive and full of grandeur; and compared with some of his noble passages Burke's sublimity sometimes seems as unsubstantial as banks of cloud by the side of a granite mountain.

While Webster was slow in reaching his full mental stature, how rapidly his style developed and simplicity took the place of the flowery exaggeration that was then

thought to be fine, may be seen by contrasting passages from two of his speeches. In his Fourth of July address delivered at Hanover a year before his graduation occurs this passage : "Fair science, too, holds her gentle empire among us, and almost innumerable altars are raised to her divinity from Brunswick to Florida. Yale, Providence and Harvard now grace our land, and Dartmouth, towering majestic above the groves which encircle her, now inscribes her glory on the register of fame. Oxford and Cambridge, those Oriental stars of literature, shall now be lost, while the bright sun of American science displays his broad circumference in uneclipsed radiance." The other is from a speech early in his Congressional career against the policy of forcing the growth of manufactures, or rearing them, as he expressed it, "in hotbeds." "I am not anxious to accelerate the approach of the period when the great mass of American labor shall not find its employment in the field ; when the young men of the country shall be obliged to shut their eyes upon external nature, upon the heavens and the earth, and immerse themselves in close and unwholesome workshops ; when they shall be obliged to shut their ears to the bleatings of their own flocks upon their own hills, and to the voice of the lark that cheers them at the plough." The one passage is little above or below the style then prevailing among schoolboys ; the other possesses a simple and lyric beauty and might have been written by a master of English prose in its golden age.

In his speech upon the Greek revolution, delivered while he was still a member of the House, his style may be said to have become fixed in its simplicity. Upon

such a subject there was every temptation to indulge in passionate declamation about freedom and to make a tremendous display of classical learning, and such a treatment seemed to be demanded by the prevailing taste of the time; but the generous sympathy he held out to the Greeks, he extended in a speech of severe and restrained beauty and the greater part of his effort was devoted to a profound study of the principles of the Holy Alliance as a conspiracy against popular freedom. Jeremiah Mason pronounced this speech the best example of parliamentary eloquence and statesmanlike reasoning which our country had seen. The Plymouth speech greatly extended his reputation as an orator and was most impressive in its immediate effect. George Ticknor, who was disposed to be critical, and usually admired with difficulty, somewhat hysterically wrote in a letter on the day of its delivery: "I warn you beforehand that I have not the least confidence in my own opinion. His manner carried me away completely. . . . It seems to me incredible. . . . I was never so excited by public speaking before in my life. Three or four times I thought my temples would burst with the gush of blood." This speech was received everywhere with the most extravagant praise and may fairly be said to have established Webster's position as the first orator of the nation. While it contains noble passages it sometimes expresses the platitudes of the day in a style that suggests the grandiose, and it shows more strongly than any other of his important speeches the literary faults of the time. The first Bunker Hill speech and the eulogy on Adams and Jefferson are distinctly superior to it. That splendid piece of historical fiction, the speech

which he puts in the mouth of Adams, is an excellent exhibition of his ability to reproduce the spirit of a great event and endow it with life. It was precisely such a speech as the most impassioned and strongest advocate of the Declaration of Independence might have made on the floor of the Continental Congress. If Webster's understanding had been less powerful he would have been credited with a very great imagination. That faculty, however, was strictly subordinated to his reason and instead of producing anything unusual and fantastic, the creature of a disordered rather than a creative imagination, he summoned the event out of the past and so invested it with its appropriate coloring, and rational and proper setting, that it seemed to be a fact rather than a fancy.

We shall fall far short of doing justice to his power as an orator if we fail to take into account his physical endowments for speaking. There can be no doubt about the majesty of his personal presence. Business would be temporarily suspended when he walked down State Street, while people rushed to the doors and windows to see him pass. To the popular imagination he seemed to take up half the street. He stood nearly six feet, and seemed taller, and he had an enormous measurement around the chest. His head was one of the largest and noblest ever borne upon human shoulders. He had a dark complexion, a gunpowder complexion it was called, a broad and lofty brow and large black eyes, usually full of repose, but in moments of excitement blazing with terrible intensity. One of his severest critics, Theodore Parker, declared his belief that since Charlemagne there had not been such a grand figure in all Christendom.

It might be suspected that the reports were somewhat colored by pride in such an American product, but he went abroad and his personality produced as deep an impression there as at home. Sydney Smith called him "a steam engine in trousers" and "a small cathedral all by himself." To Carlyle he seemed a "magnificent specimen." The historian Hallam wrote of him that he approached as nearly the ideal of a Republican Senator as any man he had ever seen, one worthy of Rome. This enormous personality was not sluggish but in time of excitement it was full of animation and dramatic fire. Jeremiah Mason said that in him a great actor was lost to the stage. He would rise easily to the tragic force required in a murder trial and overwhelm the listener by his dramatic description of the deed, or he would entertain his college friends with a perfect imitation of the mannerisms and falsetto tones of President Wheelock. He possessed as noble a voice as ever broke upon the human ear—a voice of great compass, usually high and clear, but capable of sinking into deep tones that thrilled the listener. He made himself heard by nearly fifty thousand people at Bunker Hill. What Mr. Lodge says may easily be believed, that no one ever came into the world so physically equipped for speech.

Undoubtedly his oratorical masterpiece is the reply to Hayne. When he delivered it he was in his physical and intellectual prime. The occasion was the most important in our Congressional history. The time had come when, if ever, the doctrine of the supremacy of the federal constitution should be proclaimed and the truth impressed upon the minds and hearts of the people that the United States was not a confederacy, loosely

knit together and continuing in existence only at the pleasure of each one of the sovereign states which composed it, but that it was a nation, and that its laws, enacted in conformity with the constitution, as declared by the Supreme Court, were the supreme law of the land. This great argument over the meaning of the constitution had begun almost on the day when it was put in operation. The states-rights school of interpretation found much to support it in the construction put upon the constitution by those who had borne an important part in framing it. It had been steadily growing and its doctrines had reached their full development. The term "sovereign state" was a very attractive one to the popular mind and demanded a proper limitation upon its meaning. Hayne, too, spoke for a state which was about to attempt to put his theory into practical force. That theory had never received so captivating a presentation as he gave it. The work of formulating the creed of union so that it might become a popular force and not merely check the further advance of the doctrines of nullification, but put them on the defensive and turn them upon a retreat, naturally fell to Webster. Calhoun, with his great industry, his high personal character and his enormous power of logic was the leading advocate of states-rights. Clay did not at that time happen to be a member of the Senate. But Clay, who was a great party leader, a masterful debater and an impassioned orator, did not possess the legal training and the grasp upon principles which the occasion demanded, and orator as he was, he did not possess the choice gift of uttering the literature of genuine eloquence, of speaking the words that should wing their flight to the fire-

side of the farmer and artisan and to the study of the scholar, and set their hearts on fire for the Union. The one man for the work was the man to whom it fell.

With much that was strong and brilliant in Hayne's speech, there was a great deal that was paltry and personal and had no place in a great constitutional argument. There was an ingenious attempt to set one section of the Union against the other. New England was held up to ridicule. Hayne imitated Homer's heroes who began their fights with taunts and boasts. A personal attack was made upon Webster and he was taunted with fearing that Benton might be an overmatch for him in debate. I am not sure that this did not greatly add to the interest of the reply. It introduced the personal, human element, and served to call Webster's great combative powers fully into play. One can imagine this Titan with his whole nature aroused, thoroughly informed upon his great subject, profoundly impressed with the justice of his cause, but unhampered by any written speech, rising in the Senate and for nearly seven hours pouring forth that mighty torrent of argument, fact, irony and eloquence found in the reply. To say that the speech fully met the occasion is to give it the highest possible praise. The advantage was with Webster upon every point. When he took his seat he had triumphantly vindicated New England, he had crushed his antagonist in the personal controversy, although with a majestic scorn he had barely stooped to engage in it, and, far more important than anything else, he had reduced the doctrine of nullification to an absurdity, by demonstrating that its application would mean the disruption of the central government, would

make the Union a mere " rope of sand " and organize governmental chaos into a system. In that portion of his speech he did as much to create as to expound the constitution, and he held up to the country the image of a government limited, indeed, in its powers, but in its sphere perfect, and beyond the control of the state government. Among the many ties that bind men together there is no stronger tie than the spirit of nationality. It was to that spirit that he so fervently appealed in that splendid piece of rhetoric in the printed peroration of the speech, a peroration not indeed spoken in all its important parts to the few scores of people in the Senate chamber, but spoken to the millions of his countrymen outside of it.

It was this speech more than any other single event from the adoption of the Constitution to the Civil War, which compacted the states into a nation. There were apparently few people in the country able to read and to follow public affairs who did not read the more important portions of it. The leading newspapers published it in full. Vast numbers of copies were sent out in the form of pamphlets. It was declaimed by schoolboys in every schoolhouse. It gave the nation a definite impulse towards nationality and it laid down the battle line for those great armies which fought and triumphed in the cause of the Union.

The speech in itself is worthy of the enormous part it has played in history. It was unstudied and spontaneous and it displayed in a sublime degree that fusion of reason and passion which Macaulay pronounces necessary to true eloquence. It is energetic, direct, simple, and it has that rapidity of movement which is the first

test of intellectual vigor. It probably received less revision than speeches at that time usually received and I believe that no great speech of similar length which occupies a place near it in literature was ever the object of less verbal polishing before and after delivery. It was extemporaneous, and if we bear in mind that the art of shorthand writing was at that time by no means perfectly developed, the stenographer's report shows that the form was not greatly changed except in a few passages. The printed peroration has been pronounced by good judges, and I think rightly, artificial. It is hardly conceivable that after speaking more than six hours his extemporaneous speech should have taken that finished and balanced form. That there was little of the artificial in the spoken peroration is made evident from the shorthand report:

"While the nation lasts, we have a great prospect of prosperity; and, when this Union breaks up, there is nothing in prospect for us to look at, but what I regard with horror and despair. God forbid; yes sir, God forbid, that I should live to see this cord broken; to behold the state of things which carries us back to disunion, calamity and civil war! When my eyes shall be turned for the last time on the meridian sun, I hope I may see him shining bright, upon my united, free and happy country. I hope I shall not live to see his beams falling upon the dispersed fragments of the structure of this once glorious Union. I hope I may not see the flag of my country, with its stars separated or obliterated, torn by commotion, smoking with the blood of civil war. I hope I may not see the standard raised of separate state rights, star against star and stripe against

stripe; but that the flag of the Union may keep its stars and its stripes corded and bound together in indissoluble ties. I hope I shall not see written, as its motto, *First Liberty*, and *then Union*. I hope I shall see no such delusive and deluded motto on the flag of that country. I hope to see spread all over it, blazoned in letters of light, and proudly floating over land and sea, that other sentiment, dear to my heart, 'Union *and* Liberty, now and forever, one and inseparable.' "

As a piece of composition the printed form is doubtless the better one, but as the conclusion of a great speech in which a powerful mind under great excitement sought at the moment its appropriate form of expression it seems to me the spoken peroration is to be preferred. Instead of moving along upon symmetrical lines, beautiful and majestic, throwing the spray evenly upon either side, like a painted ship upon a painted ocean, we see him rather like a mighty battleship plunging madly through the waves, dashing the spray above its turrets, with engines throbbing irregularly and hard, the incarnation of terrible power mastering the power of the sea.

While the reply to Hayne shows Webster on the whole at his best, some of his great qualities were more conspicuously displayed in other speeches. In the debate with Calhoun three years afterwards, he made an argument against nullification which was more complete and elaborately wrought out, and which dealt that doctrine a finishing blow so far as any constitutional basis was concerned. But it was severely argumentative and did not have the popular qualities of his first great Union speech. His 7th of March speech, famous for other reasons than its rhetoric, is conversational in tone,

rising naturally to the heights of eloquence, and in its speaking style it appears to me to be the equal of the best of his speeches. It lacked any degree of the hard rhetorical form at that time deemed necessary to good oratory, and which imparted to much of it, compared with the more direct modern method, the appearance of an unknown tongue. The speech on the presidential protest is more studied than the reply to Hayne, and in it his imagination mounts on an easy wing in the celebrated passage on the military greatness of England. If any of the orators of that nation has ever given a nobler picture of her power I do not know where it can be found: "On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against a power, to which, for purposes of foreign conquest and subjugation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a power which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

What is the relative position of Webster among the great orators of the world? All would not agree upon his exact place, although all would doubtless place him very high among them. The two great orators of ancient times must, I think, be left out of the account. There is little more common ground for a comparison between Webster and Demosthenes than there would be for a comparison between a speech of Webster and a book of Homer. What common standard can be set up between the Greek who spoke to a fickle and marvel-

ously ingenious people, whose verdict when he obtained it would often only be written on water, and Webster, speaking in a different tongue, to an altogether different people, and shaping in their minds the principles of practical government to endure for generations? How many English-speaking people know enough Greek to understand a speech of Demosthenes as they would one spoken in their own language? Those who do not cannot form an exact judgment, and the few, if any, who do, are prone to find virtues in particles and, like Shakspeare's critics, to bring to view in the text things of which the orator was abjectly ignorant. Too much has been swept away in the twenty centuries since Cicero and Demosthenes spoke, and it is easy to praise those orators too little or too much. Separated from us by the barriers of distance, of language and of race, the most that can safely be ventured is that in literary form they probably surpassed any of the moderns.

The orators with whom Webster can most profitably be compared are those who employed the same language and spoke to the same race. Surely it is not a narrow field. It is a race that has employed the art of government by speaking for centuries, and has far outstripped any other people of ancient or modern times in the development of the parliamentary system. The result of that system has been to produce oratory which is not simply literature nor merely spectacular, but which at its best is especially adapted to the practical purpose of influencing the judgment of those who listen upon some momentous public question. Where, as is the case among the English-speaking peoples, the fate of a government or an administration often turns upon

the result of a single debate, where again the verdict of the parliamentary body is liable to be set aside by the people who are the sources of political power and before whom the discussion must be ultimately carried, there is a field for the development of oratory such as has never existed in any other race. Among the orators of his own country there may be individuals who in some particulars surpass him. Everett carried the elaborate oratory at that time in vogue to a greater perfection of finish and form. Webster does not show the surprises and felicities to be found in the style of Choate, who is as rapid, pure and winding as a mountain stream, and who in brilliancy of imagination easily outranks all other American orators. The only Englishmen who stand in a class with Webster are Fox and Burke. In comparing him with them it must be borne in mind that his most important speeches were made in construing the terms of a written constitution which, however beneficial it may be to individual liberty, is not a nurse of political eloquence. It imposes rigid artificial limits, and, to the extent that it requires statesmen to be the expounders of written political scriptures rather than of broad natural principles, it hampers the freedom of the mind.

Rogers said that he never heard anything equal to Fox's speeches in reply, and Burke with generous enthusiasm called him the most brilliant debater the world ever saw. That was Webster's great quality. He was pre-eminently a debater. He did not have Fox's celerity, but he possessed far greater weight. Fox would lay down a proposition and repeat it again and again. He was often stormy in manner and would sometimes mag-

nify trifles. His vehemence was so great that one occasionally suspects him of diverting attention from the weakness of an argument. But he had no affectations. He was animated by noble ideas of political freedom which comprehended not merely his own race or neighborhood, but embraced the peoples of distant lands; and regardless of literary form he would press those ideas home and strike by the most direct lines at the judgment of the listener. There was little quickness or mere dexterity about Webster, but it seemed impossible to impose upon his understanding, and his great guns would open upon the weak points of his adversary, however artfully covered up. No man could excel him in the power to destroy utterly the sham structures of sophistry. He would never set up a man of straw, but would resolutely grapple with his opponent's argument in its full force. His vigilance was extraordinary, and when surprised, as he sometimes was in running debate, it is not difficult to detect in his tone the martial note, as he rushes upon and captures the threatening position by a display of force simply portentous. It is not easy to compare Webster and Fox in the immediate effect produced by their speeches, but there can be no doubt that the personality of the former was more impressive; and if we are to trust at all to the contemporary accounts it is entirely safe to say that Fox never surpassed, if indeed he ever equalled, the tremendous effect produced by Webster in his greatest efforts. Between the speeches of the two men there can be no comparison in point of substance and literary form. Fox's speeches certainly contain one characteristic that he claimed was essential to good speeches,

they do not read well. It is not difficult to see in the best of them the evidence of his brilliant talents, but they do not strongly impress one with weight of matter or with the literary quality. In the half dozen large volumes of Webster's speeches which have been collected together there is doubtless a great deal that is prosy. An orator who speaks often and always makes an eloquent speech is usually one who will never make a great one. Only on exceptional occasions was Webster thoroughly aroused. But those volumes contain a mine of information and of reason for political students; they contain much literature of the first rank and I doubt if in all of them a sentence can be found that is flippant or petty or mean.

I have already spoken of Burke. He is, I think, superior to Webster as a political philosopher, and also in breadth of information and imaginative power, but in the excellence of the great mass of oratorical work which he left behind him he does not much surpass Webster, if at all. He presents more gorgeous passages, but even his most glittering fabrics do not imply the intellectual strength shown in the simple solidity of Webster. But if it be admitted that he precedes Webster in the permanent value of his speeches, in their temporary effect I do not think he can be classed with him. He often shot over the heads of his audience, and some of his greatest speeches emptied the House of Commons. It was said of him that he always seemed to be in a passion. Webster never permitted himself to be in a frenzy, fine or otherwise. On the whole I think it safe to say that Webster is not surpassed by Burke, and if

he is equalled by any other English-speaking orator he is equalled by Burke alone.

But whether or not Webster was the greatest of all men in power of speech, he deserves a place among the half dozen greatest orators of the world. To take rank in that chosen circle is indeed glory. For the transcendently great orator, who has kindled his own time and nation to action and who also speaks to foreign nations and distant ages, must divide with great poets the affectionate homage of mankind. While the stirring history of the Greek people and its noble literature shall continue to have charm and interest for men, the wonderfully chiselled periods of Demosthenes and the simple yet lofty speech of Pericles will be no less immortal than the odes of Pindar or the tragedies of Sophocles or Aeschylus. The light that glows upon the pages of Virgil shines with no brighter radiance than is seen in those glorious speeches with which Cicero moved that imperial race that dominated the world. The glowing oratory of Edmund Burke will live until sensibility to beauty and the generous love of liberty shall die. And I believe the words of Webster, nobly voicing the possibilities of a mighty nation as yet only dimly conscious of its destiny, will continue to roll upon the ears of men while the nation he helped to fashion shall endure, or indeed while government founded upon popular freedom shall remain an instrument of civilization.

It is sometimes said of Webster that as a statesman he was not creative and that no great legislative acts are identified with his name; that he was the unrivalled advocate of policies but not their originator. It must be remembered that during most of his Congressional

career his party was in a minority and he had only a limited opportunity to fashion political legislation. He did not, it is true, pass any considerable portion of his time in drawing bills, embodying more or less fanciful theories of government. But he displayed in a prominent degree the qualities of statesmanship most loudly called for by his time. He was highly successful in adapting to the needs of a nation the provisions of a written constitution, by applying to its construction the soundest principles of government. It was beyond human foresight for the framers of the Constitution to comprehend the unknown demands of the future. The application of that frame of government to new needs and conditions demanded as high and as original an order of statesmanship as was required in the first instance to write it. It might easily have supported a greatly different structure of government if it had been less wisely expounded. If our highest court has been able to recognize supposed national exigencies and apply contradictory judicial constructions to the same clause of the Constitution, we can easily see that it might indeed be a flexible instrument in the hands of statesmen whose prime function is political and not judicial. But there was no paltry expediency in Webster's expounding. His recognition of sound principles, his profound sympathy with the genius of our system, and his true political sense enabled him to display the most difficult art of statesmanship, the practical application of theory to the government of a nation. The principles of government are derived from a long series of experiments, and the statesman who produces something novel produces something which experience will

usually show it is well to avoid. Originality of statesmanship does not alone consist in bringing forth something unheard of in government, or in keeping on hand, as Sieyes was said to have done, a large assortment of constitutions ready made. Neither can I see originality or even a high order of statesmanship in patching up a truce by some temporary device, which, after it shall have lost its effect, will leave the body politic in a worse condition than when it found it. Webster aided in making the Constitution work among conditions that its founders did not foresee. He contributed to protect it from danger, against which they made no provisions and to endow it with perpetuity. His adherence to sound principles was as resolute as his recognition of them was instinctive. He would not be swerved from them by considerations of temporary expediency. This unbending quality and an indisposition to appeal to a pseudo-patriotism prevented him in the conditions then existing from becoming a great party leader, and in that respect he strikingly resembled Fox. After a career unexampled among statesmen, in its constant treatment of liberty as a birthright of all men and not as a peculiar prerogative of Englishmen, it was said of Fox's following in Parliament that they could all be put in a hackney coach. The reason is obvious. The British Parliament has usually been jealous for British freedom, but when British demands come in conflict with the freedom of foreign peoples, liberty then becomes a much less influential sentiment than what on such occasions is sometimes termed humanity and sometimes civilization.

Let us follow Webster's course upon some of the

more important issues of his time in order to gain a practical insight into his statesmanship. He was a friend of commerce, which, he declared, had paid the price of independence, and he was in favor of encouraging it both with foreign nations and between the states themselves. He was, therefore, strenuously opposed to the embargo which preceded and attended the war with Great Britain. He was so hostile to the war itself that he refused to vote supplies to carry it on. Even that much quoted passage, so frequently employed against those who would question proposed aggressions upon other peoples, "our party divisions, acrimonious as they are, cease at the water's edge" was uttered by him in a speech against a bill to encourage enlistment. He was opposed to the war because he thought it inexpedient and wrong. The question of peace or war he declared was "not to be compressed into the compass that would fit a small litigation." It was a great question of right and expediency. "Considerations which go back to the origin of our institutions and other considerations which look forward to our hopeful progress in future times, all belong, in their just proportions and graduations, to a question in the determination of which the happiness of the present and of future generations may be so much concerned. Utterly astonished at the declaration of war, I have been surprised at nothing since. Unless all history deceived me, I saw how it would be prosecuted when I saw how it was begun. There is in the nature of things an unchangeable relation between rash counsels and feeble execution." The struggle itself, whether just or unjust at its inception, became almost a war of self-preserva-

tion, and Webster's attitude was an extreme one in refusing to vote the necessary means to carry it on. At a much later period of his life he voted for supplies for the war with Mexico, to which he had also been opposed. But his position was unassailable when during the war of 1812 he declined to be badgered out of the right of public discussion, for he did not escape the fury of the small patriots of his time. "It is," he said, "a home-bred right, a fireside privilege. . . . It is not to be drawn in controversy. . . . Belonging to private life as a right, it belongs to public life as a duty. . . . This high constitutional privilege I shall defend and exercise within this House and without this House, and in all places, in time of peace, in time of war."

His earlier speeches in Congress on the tariff were upon free trade lines and against the exercise of the taxing power of the Constitution for the purpose of protection. During his term of service in the House he voted against tariff bills that were protective in their nature, but after he became a member of the Senate he voted for such bills, and he has often been accused of inconsistency on account of these apparently contradictory votes. But his answer was simple and apparently conclusive. He had opposed the policy of artificially calling manufactures into being, but it had been adopted. New England had acquiesced in a system which had been forced upon her against the votes of her representatives. Manufactures had been built up and he would not vote to strike them down.

During the early years of his service in the House he began his advocacy of a sound money system and he

continued to support it, while the currency was an issue, to the end of his career. The delusive arguments in favor of a money which the art of printing made cheap of production did not impose upon him. No man of his time set forth more clearly the principles of a sound system of finance or the disaster which would follow a deviation from it. He had been so conspicuous in the debates upon financial measures that President Harrison requested him to accept the Secretaryship of the Treasury at the time he became Secretary of State.

He was too firm a friend of civil justice not to make an indignant protest against the bill proposing to take the trial of certain cases of treason from the courts and give them to military tribunals.

The Force bill of 1833, which gave Jackson the authority to cope with the nullification movement in South Carolina, would probably have failed of passage without Webster's support. That measure, however, became of little consequence after the substantial concession to that state made in the tariff propositions brought forward by Mr. Clay, who was usually ready to apply temporary devices to any threatening situation. Webster austerey declined to surrender to the threats of South Carolina and voted against the tariff bill.

He jealously upheld the prerogatives of the Senate and resolutely severed the growing friendship between himself and Jackson, when the latter showed a disposition towards personal government and an autocratic administration of the laws. But first of all he was attached to the principles of popular government, and while a Senator he favored a broad construction of the power which the Constitution gave to the representa-

tives to originate revenue bills. In a running debate in the Senate he took the position that territories were not a part of the United States, within the meaning of the Constitution, and he referred for authority to a class of decisions of the Supreme Court. It so happened that the court had decided but a single case of the class he mentioned, and that he himself had been of counsel. It showed his remarkable memory and command of his resources that thirty years afterwards he was able, apparently upon the spur of the moment, to urge in all its force the argument he had prepared in the law case. The court, however, although it had decided the case in his favor, had not put its decision upon the ground he urged. In the same debate in the Senate he made it clear, whatever he may have meant in claiming that the Constitution did not extend to the territories, that the oath of members of Congress bound them to observe its limitations even when legislating for the territories, which is an essential point in the great controversy in which he has recently been so often cited as an authority. So far from admitting that a denial of Congressional absolutism in dealing with human rights anywhere would make our government an incomplete or crippled government, he saw in tendencies of an opposite character the danger that our constitution would be converted "into a deformed monster," into a great "frame of unequal government" and "into a curse rather than a blessing." He also gave weighty expression to the opinion that while arbitrary governments could govern distant possessions by different laws and different systems we could do no such thing. He protested against the policy of admitting new and small states into the

Union, because of its tendency to destroy the balance established by the Constitution and convert the Senate into an oligarchy, a policy which has been pursued until at last states having less than a sixth of the population of the country elect a majority of the entire Senate. He took a leading part in the codification of the criminal laws of the nation and in the enlargement of its judicial system. He profoundly deplored the existence of slavery and many striking utterances against it may be found in his speeches, but he held to the opinion, which, indeed, appears to have prevailed everywhere at that time, that the national government had no authority under the Constitution to interfere with slavery in the states where it was established. He believed that the non-political offices of the government should not be used as party spoils, and a generation before civil service reform made its appearance on this continent he gave luminous expression to its most essential principles. His public career was singularly free from demagoguery and his speeches will be explored in vain for catch-penny appeals to the passing popular fancy. One of the great achievements of his career, as well as one of the most definite and honorable triumphs of American diplomacy, is found in the negotiation of the Webster-Ashburton treaty. The dispute over the Northeastern boundary had for years been a source of irritation between this country and Great Britain and had baffled such earnest attempts at solution that it promised to continue a menace to the peace of the two nations. It had defied the good offices of arbitration. It was complicated with domestic difficulties and the American negotiations had been hampered by the rights of one of

the states of the Union. The British government had finally dispatched a large number of soldiers to Canada, and our minister at London expressed the opinion that war appeared inevitable. There were also other annoying sources of dispute aside from that relating to the boundary. Webster triumphantly overcame all obstacles, and he could proudly appeal, as he subsequently did in the Senate, "to the public men of the age whether, in 1842. and in the city of Washington, something was not done for the suppression of crime, for the true exposition of the principles of public law, for the freedom and security of commerce on the ocean, and for the peace of the world." The qualities which he displayed in these negotiations attracted attention in the British Parliament. Macaulay commented on his "firm, resolute, vigilant and unyielding" manner. Diplomatic writing has a peculiar rhetoric, a rhetoric which Webster had the good sense to refuse to adopt in preference to his own. Compared with his condensed and weighty letter upon impressment, for instance, the ordinary fawning or threatening diplomatic performance seems a flimsy structure indeed. The claim, on the part of the British government, of the right to impress British-born sailors from the decks of American ships could not survive the conclusive arguments which he crowded into the brief letter to Ashburton, and which without any pretense led to the conclusion that "the American government then is prepared to say that the practice of impressing seamen from American vessels cannot be hereafter allowed to take place." And then he ran up the flag, not for rhetorical purposes, but over the solid foundation of reason, from which it can never be hauled

down without overturning established principles : "In every regularly documented American vessel the crew who navigate it will find their protection in the flag that is over them." No one could mistake the meaning of what was so simply stated after its justice had been so conclusively shown. It is impossible for an American to read the diplomatic correspondence of Webster while Secretary of State and not feel a new pride in his country. The absolute absence of anything petty or meretricious, the simple dignity and the sublime and conscious power cause one to feel that it ennobled the nation to have such a defender. It may be said, too, that the manner in which he conducted the State department proved that he possessed the highest qualities of executive statesmanship.

But the overshadowing work of his public life is to be found in the part he performed in maintaining the supremacy of the laws of the national government enacted in conformity with the Constitution. In the great controversy over the relations between the central and state governments, which began soon after the adoption of the Constitution and continued until it was removed from the forum of debate to be settled by the arbitrament of arms, Webster was the colossal figure. From the high ground he took in the reply to Hayne he never wavered. If he erred at all in his devotion to the national idea, it was in the sacrifices he was willing to make for it. Twenty years after his first great discussion upon the Union, he made a speech on that subject which excited fiercer controversy than has ever been kindled by any other utterance of an American statesman. I refer to the speech which, whatever it might

be appropriately called from its theme, will probably always retain the name of the Seventh of March Speech. It gave rise to more criticism, to employ no harsher term, than grew out of all the rest of his public career. The alienation, which it occasioned, from many of his former friends, who were grieved to the heart and regarded him after the seventh of March as a fallen archangel, the relentless abuse it drew forth from others who had never been his friends, embittered the last days of his life. A half century after it was spoken we should be able to hear something of those permanent voices which are drowned in the fleeting tumult of the times, but which speak to after ages. I do not agree that that speech must be passed by in silence out of regard for Webster's fame. Twenty years ago the poet Whittier made noble reparation for "Ichabod" in the "Lost Occasion," and even more ample reparation would be his due if in judging him one applied the same tests that are apparently applied to his critics.

When he replied to Hayne, the danger to the Union was chiefly theoretical, except for the attitude of a single state, but on the seventh of March the controversy had become more angry and practical. Only a few weeks before he spoke, an anti-slavery society, most respectable in numbers and the character of its members, had met in his own state, and in Faneuil Hall, and had resolved that they were the enemies of the Constitution and Union and proclaimed their purpose to "live and labor for a dissolution of the present Union." These resolutions were but the echo of what had come from a similar society in the state of Ohio. They emanated not from the home of nullification doctrines, but from

that portion of the country where the hopes of the Union lay. There was an equally uncompromising and a more resentful feeling upon the other side of the slavery questions, and a convention had been called at the city of Nashville to give it voice. That convention subsequently put forth an address in favor of disunion. The annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico and the treaty of peace had produced practical and pressing questions, and Webster had come reluctantly to believe that their solution, without detriment to the Union, was most difficult in the inflamed condition of the public mind. More than a year after he made the speech he declared that "in a very alarming crisis" he felt it his "duty to come out." "If," he said at that time, "I had seen the stake, if I had heard the fagots already crackling, by the blessing of Almighty God, I would have gone on and discharged the duty which I thought my country called upon me to perform."

That a similar opinion of the importance of the crisis was entertained by those two great men whose names stand perhaps next to his own and forever to be associated with it in our Congressional annals, there can be no doubt. There is something pathetic in the spectacle of those three statesmen, then almost at the end of their careers, who had often radically differed with each other upon public questions, bending their energies to the support of a common cause and struggling to avert a common danger. Clay put forth a last effort of his statesmanship and brought forward his compromise measure. For the moment he forgot his differences with Webster and earnestly besought the latter for his support. Calhoun, too weak to utter his own

words, spoke through the mouth of another, in his last speech in the Senate, his sense of the gravity of the crisis. It was said, and has been so often repeated that it is accepted in some quarters as an article of political faith, that Webster made his speech as a bid for the Presidency. The imputation of an unworthy motive to a public man is easy to make and difficult to disprove. But on this point it is pertinent to remember that he threw away his fairest chance for the Presidency by patriotically refusing, at the dictates of his own party in his own state and of its leaders in the country, to retire from Tyler's cabinet until our differences with Great Britain should be composed ; that he had many times resigned or refused to accept important public office ; that the great position of Senator from Massachusetts had more than once to be forced upon him, and that, before the 7th of March at least, he had fully lived up to his own impressive declaration that solicitations for high public office were " inconsistent with personal dignity and derogatory to the character of the institutions of the country." Solicitude for the Union was no new thing with him, that an ignoble motive should be ascribed. But it was not the first time, or probably will not be the last, when those having in view the accomplishment of some great public object to the exclusion of everything else, have imputed evil motives to those who have not sanctioned their particular course of procedure, especially when they threatened to pull down the pillars of the state itself, if thereby the evil might be destroyed in the common calamity. Reform draws to itself not only the single-minded who have no sordid aims, but it is attractive also to those censorious spirits who delight

not so much in battering down the ramparts of wrong as in abusing those hapless individuals who will not agree that evil methods are to be sanctified by noble ends. In the speeches of some of the leaders of the anti-slavery movement, denunciation of slavery had the second place and denunciation of Webster the first, and when the time of consummation came, even Lincoln did not escape their acrimony.

The high moral purpose and the great practical value of the abolition movement cannot be questioned. But it also cannot be questioned that a good deal of the agitation was disruptive, and, in the conditions then existing, tended less towards freedom than to disunion and war. They might have broken the "compact with hell" which was the favorite term of some of them for the Constitution of their country, but it is not easy to see how this programme could have broken a single chain, with a free and a slave republic side by side and hostile to each other. In the light of to-day it can be clearly seen that to accomplish freedom the concurrence of other forces was demanded. The truth will often ultimately spring from apparently contradictory forces. Agitation was necessary to educate and arouse the people, but it needed also to be checked before it should become swollen beyond constitutional limits and form the basis of a revolution, for with any important body of opinion at the North co-operating with disunion at the South, the nation would have been rent asunder.

But look a little more closely at the matter. I presume no one would now criticise the willingness of Webster, as the great advocate of constitutional supremacy, to accord to the South whatever it had a right, accord-

ing to the terms of the Constitution, to demand. The specific thing in the speech criticised, with the nearest approach to justice, was the position with regard to New Mexico. He declared that natural law had effectively banished slavery from that territory, because of its sterile and mountainous character, and that he would not vote uselessly to re-enact the will of God and banish slavery by a statute. He therefore accepted that feature of Clay's compromise with the declaration that he would favor the application of the so-called Wilmot proviso to any territory in which there was any danger that slavery might be established. This was certainly a technical if not a practical concession to the Southern demands. For accepting this policy with regard to New Mexico, he was accused by Mr. Seward, who undoubtedly spoke the sentiments of the Free Soil leaders, with having "derided the proviso of freedom, the principle of the ordinance of 1787." Ten years later, when it did not require a statesman's eye to see the danger, nor a statesman's ear to hear the thunders of the approaching storm, Congress consented to apply the very principle which Webster was willing to concede to New Mexico, to the whole of that vast domain out of which the Dakotas and Nevada and Colorado have since been carved, and neither Seward nor Adams nor Sumner, nor any other member of Congress belonging to the great new anti-slavery party, was heard to raise his voice or vote against it. These men were his critics. Surely, if Webster was a traitor to the cause of freedom, they must keep him company. If he was a traitor, their guilt was deeper than his, for they were the special guardians of freedom while he was only the champion of the Union ; and the

scornful repeal by the South of the settlement of 1850 shed a brighter light for them than was given to him, upon the futility of all compromise. The truth is, none of them was a traitor. They were true-hearted, patriotic men, solicitous for the preservation of the Republic which they loved. But when the most responsible of Webster's accusers saw the danger, as he saw it, they were willing to make concessions to slavery far more hateful than any of which he had ever dreamed.

In the great conflict of arms in which the debate finally culminated, it was the sentiment of Union that banded those invincible armies together, and it was only through the triumph of that sentiment that we enjoyed the blessings of a restored government and that the slave secured his freedom. And had that great statesman on the 7th of March shown any less anxiety for the Union, had that great centripetal force become centrifugal or weakened in the attraction which it exerted to hold the states in their orbits, who shall say that our magnificent and now united domain might not be covered by two hostile flags, one of which would float over a republic founded upon slavery!

And then there is that ill-omened thing which, wherever else it may be found, is sure to attend greatness. The baleful goddess of Detraction sits ever at the elbow of Fame unsweetening what is written upon the record. Whether it springs from the envy of rivals or from the tendency in human nature to identify the material of greatness with common clay, it is true, as Burke says, that obloquy is an essential ingredient in the composition of all true glory. This proof of greatness, such as it is, exists in ample measure in the history of Web-

ster. No man since Washington has had more of it. The pity of it all is that when an unsupported charge is disproved, some people will shake their heads and say it is very unfortunate that it should have been necessary to establish innocence, as if reproof belonged rather to the innocent victim than to the author of the calumny.

I have alluded to the Seventh of March Speech, which has been accounted one of his crimes. One other matter I shall notice because it bears upon a point which has often been conceded to be the weak place in his character. It so happens that in this case a slander was tested and the evidence upon it carefully marshalled before a Congressional investigating committee. He was charged in Congress with a misuse of the Secret Service Fund while Secretary of State. A resolution of inquiry upon the subject was presented in the Senate while he was a member of that body. He opposed it. Rather a singular course, it might be said, for an innocent man to take. It would ordinarily be regarded as an evidence of guilt. It might also show an extraordinary degree of public virtue and indicate one of the rare men to whom the interests of their country were dearer than their own, even than their own reputations. What it implied in this instance may be inferred from the event.

A law had been framed evidently on the theory that in conducting the government it would sometimes be necessary to employ secret agents for confidential purposes, and a fund was created to be expended upon the sole responsibility of the President. A publication of the special disbursements would violate the spirit of the law, and, to say nothing of the bad faith with reference

to the past, might cripple the government in its future operations. Webster declared in the Senate that every dollar had been spent for a proper public purpose, but that he could not wish to see an important principle and law violated for any personal convenience to himself. The Senate refused to make the inquiry. The author of the charges, writhing under the lashing which Webster had administered to him in a speech in the Senate, again pressed them in the House and a committee of investigation was appointed. That committee was politically hostile to Webster and was appointed with a view to his impeachment, if the charges were sustained. It made a thorough investigation and it appeared, as the outcome of it all, that Webster had not indeed displayed the highest skill as an accountant, but it appeared also that he himself had paid the amount of certain lost vouchers out of his own pocket. The report concluded that there was no proof "to impeach Mr. Webster's integrity or the purity of his motives in the discharge of the duties of his office." And that report exonerating the defender of the Union will not lose weight from the fact that it bears the name of Jefferson Davis.

It is true that his friends contributed considerable sums of money to his support, and for this he was severely criticised. Burke received from his friends during his life, gifts, or loans that were never repaid, to an enormous amount for those days. Fox's friends gave him an annuity of \$15,000. I do not know that it has occurred to anyone to accuse either of them of impropriety. Can it be doubted that Webster's friends were as much attached to him, or that they gave from pure personal loyalty mingled with a desire to maintain in the service

of their country, talents as splendid as ever Fox or Burke possessed, and that were even more successfully employed? It is to be regretted from the abuse to which his example may give rise that he found it necessary to receive this aid. The danger is that a far lesser man than Webster in a high public place might receive a more calculating homage. However, each case must be judged on its own merits. It is very true that he was not a bookkeeper. But if accounts had been carefully kept, it may be doubted whether even from the money standpoint he did not give more than he received. Instead of neglecting his profession and eking out his expenses by the aid of friends, he might have remained out of the public service and enjoyed the most lucrative practice at the American bar. His father and his brother made great sacrifices to educate him, but it must also not be forgotten that he taught school, and at the same time copied two large volumes of deeds at night and generously gave the proceeds of it all to his brother; and that he assumed and paid his father's debts. He certainly was not a man "who much receives but nothing gives." He had a regal nature and men would give him their all because he was as free and generous as he was receptive.

There is a strong light thrown upon this trait of his character by an incident which among great speeches and public policies may seem an unimportant incident, and yet as showing the real character of the man is a great one. A young man who had been employed by him in connection with his farms in the West came to Washington, where he fell ill. Webster was at that time nearly sixty years old, at the summit of his fame and engrossed in his public duties. But he

saw this farmer's boy sick in the city among strangers. He took care of him with his own hands. For a week he was with him almost constantly day and night. Critics have applied to this generous nature the little standards for little men. They have told us that he ought not to have been extravagant; that he did not closely calculate his expenses; that he did not carefully keep his accounts; and as they would arraign a petty criminal before a police court, they have harried this transcendent figure at history's bar. They demanded too much of Nature. If she had tried to do more for him upon whom she had lavished so many gifts, she might indeed have made him a great clerk or book-keeper, but she might also have spoiled him as a statesman. Careless he may have been, but anything like conscious corruption was utterly alien to his nature.

And now having spoken to you, I fear much too long, of those things in his career which I thought best suited for bringing out my idea of him, let us look back at him for a moment before we leave him. We have seen him the greatest lawyer of his time and one of the greatest orators of all times. We have seen him, too, the resolute and masterful statesman, not swayed by trifles, but aiming to govern according to far-sighted policies a nation dominated by great principles and of chief consequence to itself or mankind only as it faithfully adhered to them; a statesman who shed a white light far across the future pathway of his own country, and who illuminated, too, the courses of self-governing nations, wherever they might exist. He never outgrew the simple loves of his youth. At Marshfield it was his habit to rise before daybreak to watch the

coming of the dawn. It was said that his cattle knew him, and, even more than his open hospitality, his herds of fine oxen kept him poor. It was one of his pleasures to feed them with ears of corn out of his own hand, and only a few days before he died he had some of the noblest of them brought before his window that he might get comfort from looking out upon their broad brows and their great mild eyes. The passion for fishing never left him. He delighted to wade in some brook for trout, but of all things he loved to go out in a little skiff upon the sea. "Marshfield and the sea, the sea," he would cry when the burdens of political life grew heavy upon him. The farmers about his home loved him and it so happened that they gathered together from miles around and went out in a great procession to meet him when he returned to Marshfield the last summer of his life. Those who knew him best, his family and his near friends, were devoted to him. What he was as a statesman and an orator, he was as a man.

To the College which, now well into the second century of her life, still has upon her the freshness of the morning, those early years of struggle, no less narrow and straitened for her than for him, take on an air of romance. To me, no other part of his career seems so much to be revered as when that matchless youth in all the innocence and perfection of nature, with those infinite possibilities in his soul, received here the first of the lessons which taught him how to use his superb gifts for the benefit of mankind. The campus hedged with elms, yonder venerable hall, these encircling hills, whether clad with the green of springtime or, as now, flaming with the gold of autumn, became a

part of his life and all speak to us of him. Men die, but the College is immortal. A hundred classes have followed him and hundreds more I doubt not will yet prolong the line. Her sons will continue to bear their part where the intellectual strife is the fiercest and where shape is given to the destinies of their times. But whatever the future may bring to the College, however she may hereafter "teem with new prodigies," she will always proudly cherish and, as the succeeding centuries roll around, will reverently commemorate, the fame of Daniel Webster.

Conferring of Honorary Degrees.

By the President of the College.

RESIDENT Tucker in conferring the honorary degrees said :

"The trustees of Dartmouth College direct me to express their pleasure in inviting into our academic fellowship the following persons through the honorary degree of Master of Arts:

"Samuel Appleton, of St. Paul, Minnesota; Frank Dunklee Currier, Congressman, Second District of New Hampshire; James Waldron Remick, Judge of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire; Harry Gene Sargent, Mayor of Concord; Wendell Phillips Stafford, Judge of the Supreme Court of Vermont.

"The trustees of Dartmouth College authorize me to confer upon the following persons the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws :

"Chester Bradley Jordan; Governor of the State of New Hampshire, honorable in purpose, sagacious in counsel, decisive in action.

“Edgar Aldrich ; Judge of the United States District Court for New Hampshire, whose dignity conserves the tradition of the bench, whose sense of justice accords with the spirit of the law, whose love of literature enriches his learning and adorns his speech.

“William Eaton Chandler ; for forty-six years an able servant of the state and of the country, initiator of the new navy, actively identified with the aggressive policy of the nation, bold, astute, tenacious, rich in sentiment and feeling.

“James Fairbanks Colby; jurist and teacher, thorough in research, independent in opinion, inflexible in ideals of justice and duty.

“Frank Swett Black ; lawyer and executive, clear and direct of purpose, strong and fearless in municipal reform, a student of law, a leader of men, true to himself in professional and public life.

“Francis Brown; scholar, honor to an honorable name, of repute at home, of repute abroad, staunch in loyalty to truth, at the forefront in theological progress.

“Samuel Walker McCall; Member of Congress from the Eighth District of Massachusetts, student of men and of events, who reads the issues of the times, not in the glare of the hour, but in the light of history, steadfast in conviction, strong in utterance, in action above expediency.

“William Everett ; Head Master of the Adams school, highly endowed and variously accomplished, an ornament to the professions he has served, delighting most in the ancient calling of schoolmaster.

“Edward Everett Hale ; venerated and beloved, comforter and quickener of men, devoted to the social

well being, whose citizenship is acknowledged alike in the republic of letters, of the state, and of religion.

"George Frisbie Hoar; senior Senator from Massachusetts, fit successor of Webster, master of speech, advocate of freedom, a patriot who widens the bounds of party to satisfy the demands of liberty and justice.

"Melville Weston Fuller; Chief Justice of the United States, graduate of Bowdoin, of Dartmouth lineage and succession, grandson of Judge Henry Weld Fuller of the class of 1801, grandson of Chief Justice Nathan Weston of the class of 1803, successor in office to Salmon Portland Chase of the class of 1826, who adds to inheritance and succession, learning, insight, character, watchful guardian of the Constitution, firm arbiter of justice.

"I am also authorized by the trustees of Dartmouth College to confer the degree of Doctor of Laws upon the following persons in absence :

"James Bryce; interpreter of the American people and of the American government to the world.

"John Hay; pilot of the ship of State through uncharted seas.

"Booker Taliaferro Washington; leader of a race out of childhood into manhood.

"I am also authorized to announce that at a meeting of the trustees held in June it was voted to confer the degree of Doctor of Laws upon Frank Palmer Goulding of the class of 1863, who has fallen from our ranks, leaving to us the honor of his character, attainments, and career."

The recipients of the degrees were greeted with great enthusiasm, the whole audience rising to its feet

as the degree was conferred upon Senator Hoar and upon Chief Justice Fuller. The enthusiasm was no less marked in the case of those upon whom degrees were conferred in absence.

Program.

The site of Webster Hall is on the lot at the northeast corner of the Common, opposite Rollins Chapel. The lot was given by the Honorable Levi Parsons Morton, LL. D., Honorary '81. The building is erected through the contributions of the alumni. The architect is Charles Alonzo Rich, '75, of New York. At 2:30 o'clock a vast assembly was gathered to listen to the addresses and to witness the ceremonies attending the laying of the corner-stone.

March from Tannhauser.

Wagner

Salem Cadet Band.

Choral Invocation—Domine Salvam Fac.

Gounod

Address of the Presiding Officer, Frank Sherman Streeter, Esquire, '74, of the Board of Trustees, Chairman of the Building Committee.

Address by the Honorable Frank Swett Black, '75.

Laying of the corner-stone of Webster Hall by Lewis Addison Armistead, great grandson of Daniel Webster.

Chorus—Praise ye the Father.

Gounod

Prayer of Dedication by the Reverend Cyrus Richardson, D. D., '64.

Chorus—Men of Dartmouth.

Morse

Exercises in the Old Chapel.

Out-of-Door Concert by the Salem Cadet Band.

Address of the Presiding Officer.

By Frank Sherman Streeter, Esquire, '74.

Mr. President and Friends:

URING the last six years, the trustees have erected six new buildings, at a cost of somewhat more than four hundred thousand dollars.

Richardson and Fayerweather are devoted to the dormitory life of the students. Butterfield and Wilder fur-

nish a home for two of the important departments of the College. The Central Heating Station is a most valuable addition to the general College plant, and College Hall is designed to become the center of student social life.

We are now beginning the erection of a new structure which is to serve a double purpose. In this building will be carried on the active administration of the College. On the main floor will be found the offices of the president, treasurer, dean, trustees, and faculty. Here will be the working center of the College life. The upper floor will be used exclusively for academic occasions. In a stately hall will be gathered and preserved all that will keep fresh in the general mind the romantic beginnings of the College, her splendid history, and the fine achievements of her more illustrious sons in the work of the world.

Here the active administration of the College will be carried on under the very eye, as it were, of all that is best and noblest in her past history. The president, the trustees, and the faculty unite in the belief that the history, sentiments, and traditions, here to be ever present, will be of large value in aiding them to administer wisely this great charitable trust.

The College has invited one of her most distinguished and honored sons to say the fitting word on this great occasion. I present to you the Honorable Frank Swett Black, a graduate of the class of 1875 and ex-Governor of the state of New York.

Address at the Laying of the Corner-Stone of Webster Hall.

By the Honorable Frank Swett Black, '75.

Mr. President, Gentlemen of Dartmouth College, and
Fellow Citizens :

HIS simple ceremony, unmarked by pretense or display, beginning a structure dedicated to the cold pursuit of learning, exposes to the observant eye that American trait which is the stone on which the corner of the national temple stands and where the heaviest timbers rest. It is that respect for order, liberty and law which stands against every trial and which no commotion can dislodge or break. Underneath, as all support must be, naked of adornment or inscription, imbedded in the earth where no eye can behold and no applause can cheer, it rests serene in its everlasting work, unmoved in its native strength. Over its head the tower may rise with gilded dome and commemorative arch to excite the wonder of the throng, but it alone, in silent and complete obscurity, will rest forever unapplauded and unseen. And yet it is the base without which no monument can stand. It is the foundation whose weakness or decay would bring all the glory standing over it to ruin and despair. It was not by show or glitter or by sound that the great moments of history were marked, and the great deeds of mankind were wrought. The color counts for nothing ; it is the fibre alone that lasts. The precept will be forgotten unless the deed is remembered. The wildest strains of martial music will pass away on the wind, while the grim and deadly courage of the soldier, moving and

acting without a word, will mark the spot where pilgrims of every race will linger and worship forever.

No character in the world more clearly saw the worth of substance and the mockery of show than he in whose honor this structure will be reared. And this tribute to him who for nearly half a century has been gone from the sight of men is a tribute also to those who remember and respect the qualities which he exemplified, and to that renowned institution where his early years were spent. His college is no longer a "lesser light on the literary horizon of our country." It has risen and increased from the hour of his devout and matchless service until its kindly light has encircled the world, revealing and proclaiming in its great career the doctrine that, although vanity and pretense may flourish for a day, there can be no lasting triumph not founded on the truth.

The life of Daniel Webster moved upon that high, consistent plane which the surroundings of his youth inspired. Poverty is a hard but oftentimes a loving nurse. If fortune denies the luxuries of wealth, she makes generous compensation in that greater love which they alone can know who have faced privations together. The child may shiver in the fury of the blast, which no maternal tenderness can shield him from, but he may feel a helpless tear dropped upon his cheek which will keep him warm till the snows of time have covered his hair. It is not wealth that counts in the making of the world, but character. And character is best formed amid those conditions when every waking hour is filled with struggle, where no flag of truce is ever sent and only darkness stays the conflict. Give me the hut that

is small enough, the poverty that is deep enough, the love that is great enough, and I will raise from them the best there is in human character. And so it came to pass that Daniel Webster left his home for college bearing those possessions which gold could not buy nor thieves despoil him of. And on this spot where nature seemed to do her best, this noble institution which he loved developed with patient care his splendid powers. This lad, uncouth and poor, without aid or accidental circumstance, rising as steadily as the sun, marked a path across the sky so luminous and clear that there is not one to mate it to be discovered in the heavens, and throughout its whole majestic length there is no spot or blemish in it. Injustice is the lot of every man, and Webster had his share. He had stood in the open field for many years and round him shone a constant, steady light. He had borne responsibility with such dignity and power that universal admiration followed him. He had been in many a desperate conflict, and in each his was the giant mind, and from each he had worn away the victor's wreath. Proud yet sensitive, strong and yet dependent, conscious of his own integrity, filled with intense devotion to his country, around the head of this majestic figure descended that storm of bitter and unreasoning anger which always gathers when deep convictions have settled in fiery hearts.

No great reform has ever been accomplished in this world without some attending outrage which would cover a smaller cause with shame. When the blood is hot and passion is in control, the man who steps before the multitude to raise the warning finger will be trodden under foot, for anger sees in reason only the sign of

treachery. And so there fell across the path of him whose life had been devoted to the cause of liberty and union a deep and cruel shadow through which he could not pass.

When old wrongs have been acknowledged and deeds long misinterpreted have been finally understood, these things the dead can never know, and this is the saddest of all the grave's relentless cruelties. But those who live to see in undisturbed perspective the grandeur of his character have realized that through all his life his purposes were honorable and high. The most enduring column on which this Union rests was fashioned by his hand. Through all this nation's unexampled progress there has been no loftier motive or ideal than those his genius has inspired. And even now, when fifty years have passed, a length of time sufficient to erase the letters in which most great names are carved, the doctrines he established are still the nation's accepted chart, the precepts he enunciated are still potent in the nation's life. He believed in individual freedom governed by tolerance and sobriety, but above all he believed in that loyal devotion to country, ever ready to be sacrificed on the altar of national permanence and success. The love of justice and fair play, and that respect for order and the law which must underlie every nation that would long endure, were deeply imbedded in his nature. These, I know, are qualities destitute of show, and whose names are never set to music, but unless there is in the people's hearts a deep sense of their everlasting value, that people can neither command respect in the time of their prosperity nor sympathy in the hour of their decay.

These are the qualities that stand the test when hurricanes sweep by. These are the joints of oak that ride the storm, and when the clouds have melted and the waves are still, move on serenely in their course. Other timbers have strewed the bottom of every sea on which the ship of human government has ever sailed, but not these. Times will come when nothing but the best will save us. Without warning and without cause, out of a clear and smiling sky, may descend the bolt that will scatter the weaker qualities to the winds. We have seen that bolt but recently descend and fill the country and the world with universal grief. Kings and peasants, with a common impulse, the high and low of every craft and creed and station with human hearts within their bosoms have bowed their heads to the wave of overwhelming sorrow. There is danger at such a time. The bolt has descended. The hurricane is passing like the rushing of the sea. Now is the time to see whether government and chaos can ever be the same. Now is the time to see whether the American character can stand amid these perilous surroundings. Now is the time when justice and fair play, order and the law, must stand on guard. These are the qualities that have lately saved us from an error which many years would not obliterate.

If in that awful wrath that recently inflamed the world, bewildered men had seized the reins of law, there is not a pulpit or a cloister from end to end of Christendom that would not have devoutly prayed that the deed should be forgiven, but if retribution had so come along that swift and fiery track, the cause of human govern-

ment would have felt a staggering blow and justice would have covered up her face.

The American character has been often proved superior to any test. No danger can be so great and no calamity so sudden as to throw it off its guard. This great strength in times of trial and this self-restraint in times of wild excitement have been attained by years of training, precept and experience. The fires of youth have been restrained by the admonitions of age. Justice has so often emerged triumphant from obstacles which seemed to chain her limbs and make the righteous path impossible, that there is now rooted in the American heart the unshaken faith that no matter how dark the night there will somehow break through at the appointed hour a light which shall reveal to their eager eyes the upright forms of Justice and the Law, still moving hand in hand, still supreme over chaos and despair, the image and the substance of the world's sublime reliance.

To this result the great of every age have made their contribution, and on the roll of honor near the head will stand his name with which this venerated institution is forever linked. And as the years advance and the great figures of the world, moving each day farther toward the horizon, grow small and indistinct, the admiration of humanity will grow more enlightened and profound for that stupendous frame which emerged from that humble home in Salisbury, now at rest forever under the Marshfield elms.

Laying of the Corner Stone.

Words of the Presiding Officer.

HE trustees have determined that this building, dedicated to the preservation of the past and the active uses of the present and future, shall bear the name of her greatest son and be forever known as Webster Hall. Within this stone which is about to be put in place, there have been deposited the following memorials :

Volume of "The Great Speeches and Orations of Daniel Webster," used as text-book in Dartmouth College.

Photograph from daguerreotype of Daniel Webster.

Ten cent postage stamp, being portrait of Daniel Webster.

Program of Webster Centennial, Dartmouth College, 1901.

General Catalogue of Dartmouth College, 1900.

Annual Catalogue of Dartmouth College, 1900-1901.

Catalogue of portraits in gallery of Dartmouth College.

Views of the principal buildings of Dartmouth College.

Inaugural address of President Tucker, June 28, 1893.

Last number of *The Dartmouth*.

Last number of the *Dartmouth Magazine*.

It is fitting that the chief block in the foundation of this building should be laid by a lineal descendant of the man whose memory is here to be preserved in enduring stone. That service will now be performed by Lewis Addison Armistead of Boston, a great grandson of Daniel Webster.

The corner-stone having been placed in position, under direction of Alexander Anderson McKenzie, '91,

Engineer in Charge, Mr. Armistead addressing the president and trustees of the College said, "Mr. President, I hereby pronounce the corner-stone of Webster Hall laid."

Exercises in the Old Chapel.

IMMEDIATELY after the exercises following the laying of the corner-stone a considerable part of the audience proceeded to the Old Chapel to listen to reminiscences of Mr. Webster by some of the older graduates and guests.

The Honorable Stephen Moody Crosby, '49, who had personal knowledge of Mr. Webster, and was familiar with the circumstances of Mr. Webster's life and career, presided.

Words of the Presiding Officer.

There are not many of us left now that can remember having seen Mr. Webster in his prime, and if the lips which must soon be closed in that silence which knows no breaking do not speak now it will not be possible for those who are younger to hear anything which shall come direct from men who knew the man in whose honor we meet to-day. Perhaps you will excuse me if I open, as no list of speakers has been furnished me. I have had no intimation from more than one or two members that they would be prepared or would have anything to say. I shall go a-fishing, therefore, for speakers, and I only hope I shall so bait my hook that I shall not fail to make a catch wherever I throw out my line.

Personally I may say, as a brilliant young female member of my family who, perhaps, is present here to-day and who will, perhaps, correct me, said, "I was brought up on Daniel Webster." I had him for dinner when I was a boy, and had him cold for supper, and warmed over in the morning for breakfast. My maternal grandfather came into New Hampshire in the closing years of the eighteenth century, and established himself in the practice of law about the time that Mr. Webster graduated. He knew Mr. Webster through the early years of his practice at the New Hampshire bar, while he was a rising lawyer, and knew him until he transferred his allegiance to the Massachusetts bar. The acquaintance then made was continued through life, and Mr. Webster was an occasional visitant at my grandfather's house. I never saw him there. But I heard the stories of him which were innumerable, and, I have no doubt, thoroughly reliable. Many of them related to the early days, and to the peculiarities of his disposition and character, some of which are now doubted, and some of which had better, perhaps, never be repeated.

Something has been said recently about his indolence of habits. I am inclined to think that so far as active, useful, physical exertion was concerned, whatever he may have liked to do as a fisherman or a hunter, in regard to active physical exertion, I am inclined to think he was a great adept at avoiding it. The old story which I heard long before I realized its value, of the scythe, when he was sent out by his father to help the mowers, of the scythe which could not be made to "hang" to suit him until he hung it over the limbs of

the historic apple-tree I do not doubt. Neither have I any reason to doubt the story that when he was called to account for what he might have done in connection with his brother who had been charged with certain duties during the father's absence, and the brother having confessed to having done nothing, Daniel claimed to have spent his time helping that brother: "Been a-helpin' Zeke, father." I have no doubt that that is correct also.

In after years, the first time I remember to have heard Webster I was a boy thirteen or fourteen perhaps, when he returned from the Tyler Cabinet at Washington in political disgrace, to his friends in Massachusetts. The political story need not be repeated, but he came back to Boston and the cold shoulder was turned towards him with almost none to do him honor. A meeting was arranged in Faneuil Hall in order that he might make his statement as to why he had stayed in Tyler's Cabinet. My father who was a life-long admirer and lover of Daniel Webster took me there as a boy to serve out to me a part of that diet of Webster. I remember the crush, I remember only as a boy how my father got up with me into a place near the platform. I remember the crowd and my difficulty in seeing over the heads of the men who thronged that hall. I remember when Mr. Webster came upon the stage in his magnificent court dress, which he always wore on state occasions—not as it was mimicked here last evening with buff trousers and a coat of black, but a magnificent figure of a man who looked as Carlyle said of him, like a cathedral. He came to the front when it was his turn to speak, and some one called for three cheers and they

were not given. One of them was given, the second failed in the attempt, nor was there any hand-clapping that would ordinarily be bestowed upon a man so prominent. His eyes absolutely blazed. They looked to me like two ship-lights at sea. He began his speech in a calm conversational tone, and went on for a little while to tell the happenings in Washington following the death of Harrison. Enlarging a little, he went on to say in more earnest tones that his purpose was to tell the people there present the history of the administration and the reasons why certain things were done in the way they were done, but that as for him—and I wish I could recall the precise words as he drew himself up and said—"If there are any gentlemen here who expect to hear from my lips a word of explanation or apology for my remaining in the cabinet of John Tyler, they are likely to go home as wise as they came," and he roared it out through the hall in such a way that he dominated that great audience, and they gave him three cheers. Before the close of the evening—he spoke about an hour and a half—they almost lifted the roof with their cheers and hand-clapping, and when the speech was ended they closed with cheers again. It made a great impression upon me as a boy. I did not understand it fully, but the marvelous power of the man so to dominate and control that audience was a thing which I never shall forget, and which I never have seen before or since in any orator.

I occasionally saw him on the street, that magnificent presence of his, walking on Washington Street, looking neither to the right nor to the left, and followed everywhere by a train of admiring people, or else

everybody stopping to gaze and look after him when he had passed. Again I saw him when he came up to Lebanon below here, at the opening of the Northern Railroad in 1847. He made a speech there, in the freight house or in an extemporized building, congratulating the State and the people at large upon the opening of that great artery of commerce. It was not anything to draw out his powers, his great powers of speech, and I have no recollection of his speech except as to the dense crowd and his effective manner.

Again I saw him the last year of his life when he was feeble, broken, when he came to Boston, and some kind of an ovation was tendered him. He really was not well enough to speak at all, though he did attempt to make a speech, which made so little impression upon me that I think it must have been a pitiable sort of an exhibition of a broken down, feeble, infirm man.

Of course I came up here to hear that magnificent eulogy which Rufus Choate pronounced upon him in the College Church; the music and the magnificent oratory of that day and hour I still remember very vividly. Allusions have been made to it two or three times in the exercises here in the last two days, and it deserved everything in the way of commendation that has been bestowed upon it.

There is another reminiscence in connection with Webster that occurs to me now, and that is of a character which would once, perhaps, have possessed some significance. If there are any among the older alumni here who remember my father, they will know if there ever was a man upon whom anything like superstition made

no kind of impress, it was he. Nothing disturbed him that was apparently out of the natural order. Whatever was, had a reason, had a cause, had some distinct purpose, but that there was ever anything supernatural about it, anything out of the ordinary, never found a rest in his heart for a moment. But this thing he used to tell as a curious coincidence. He was very much interested in regard to the sickness of Mr. Webster, and was receiving news every day, as it was furnished by the telegraph to the papers, of Mr. Webster's failing condition. One morning he awoke suddenly and spoke to my mother. He said, "Did you speak?"

"No."

"Well, somebody touched me on the shoulder, I thought, and said to me, 'Mr. Webster is passing away.'"

Well, she laughed at him. "You dreamed it. You have thought so much on that the last few days that that is not strange. You have been dreaming."

He looked at his watch and saw what the time was, and simply made a note of it. When the papers came that day he found that Mr. Webster had passed away at that time and hour and almost moment. He told the story as a curious coincidence. I do not believe that it ever affected him or disturbed him as anything that was out of the ordinary, or that had the slightest touch of what we should call now by some of the modern names, such as mind reading, or hypnotism, or Christian Science, or something of the kind, but it was the last reminiscence which lingered in my mind in regard to Daniel Webster.

Now having made my little speech and having, as I say, no list whatever of speakers who are here I must call at random. I should like to know if Judge Cross of the class of '41 is in the Chapel.

Judge David Cross, LL. D., '41.

I do n't think this is fair, Mr. President. I wandered about this building and looked into the door and asked a man if I could get in behind him so that they would not see me, and so that I could hear somebody speak, and I crawled in, thinking and hoping that I should not be called upon. Besides, Mr. President, I have agreed to say something this evening and you ought not to expect me to say anything here, but I am here, and I am not going to back out.

You suggested that, perhaps, there were but few that knew Daniel Webster or that saw him. Well, I hope there are some. You thought that I had, perhaps. In 1840 there was a Whig convention or a Whig meeting at Orford, and I, a collegian, went with the rest. Daniel Webster was announced to speak. He did not come until late and there was no one there to talk. After inquiring around we had a young man in college then that we thought was the smartest speaker that there was in the country, and we all hurried for Jim Barrett. And Jim Barrett took the stand. He made a speech from half an hour to an hour in length. Daniel Webster came on afterwards, and we all voted that Jim Barrett beat him.

Now, I heard Daniel Webster on that occasion. I heard him in court in Boston. I heard him in Manchester. I heard him in the Senate of the United

States. I heard him on several occasions, but the only occasion which clings to my memory is that of the completion of Bunker Hill Monument. I was then a student in the Law School of Harvard, and went with the students so that we had a good position not far from the speaker.

Mr. Webster stood with his back to the monument, with fifty thousand or more people to the front and on the sides of him. I saw Daniel Webster as he stood upon the platform. I have him in my mind's eye now as he was with his back to the monument with the fifty thousand people before him. I heard him for an hour or more. The words of that speech have gone from me, but yet I remember him most clearly and distinctly as he stood there. I cannot tell the words. I shall not be able to give you an idea of it, perhaps, but as he stood before us he turned his face to the monument, his back to us, and said, apostrophizing that monument, "That is the orator of the day." I will not attempt to give his words, but the thrill that went through that audience, the thrill as I felt it at that hour has been with me from that hour to this. That was a Websterian hour. It was an hour such as was seen in the Dartmouth College Case, in the Knapp Case, and in the other cases alluded to to-day. As I have journeyed through the city of Boston since then, as I have looked at that stone monument, I do not know how it is, but every time I pass that monument it seems to speak to me. I cannot help it. The thrill goes through my veins as it did in 1843. That monument to me is alive. It speaks to me in thoughts that Webster breathed and words that Webster gave us. Friends,

that hour was worth a lifetime almost to me. It was a thrill such as I never felt before nor since. I have listened to Henry Clay in the United States Senate, to Rufus Choate in his eulogy, and I have heard Choate before the jury, and other men, but never on any other occasion has such a thrill run through me as then.

But, fellow alumni, you have heard of Webster's statesmanship, of his great ability as a lawyer. We have heard of them all. They have been talked and printed and preached about, but as I come back here to-day, my thoughts, although I have heard much of Daniel Webster, go back to that Salisbury home. I remember him in thought as a young man. You, most of you, look upon him as a historical person, but let us realize that he was a New Hampshire boy, with New Hampshire affections, that he lived at the parental mansion in his younger years as a New Hampshire boy. You remember that time when he rode with his father. I don't remember whether it has been told here to-day. Perhaps it has, and perhaps it has not, but you have read of that hour when his father disclosed to him on his way to Rev. Mr. Wood his intention to send him to college. You remember that Daniel Webster then fell upon his father's neck and cried as a child. That was the Webster boy ; that was the Webster man. You remember when his brother Ezekiel wished to go to college and his father had not the means, how he went to Fryeburg and taught school and saved his three hundred dollars and gave it to his brother Ezekiel, and sent him to college. Where is the young man or boy that has done that for a brother? Where among the college students have I found one that has made a sacrifice

such as that? Talk of Daniel Webster as a statesman and a great lawyer. He was also a great brother that gave to his brother the means to help him through college. Daniel Webster was great as a statesman, but greater as a New Hampshire man, as a brother, and as a true man.

The Chairman: Judge Cross alluded to Mr. Webster's kindness of heart and to his affection. That brings to my mind a fact of which I was informed not long since that there is here to-day the original of a letter which he wrote when a member of Congress to the father of a fellow member of Congress, Mr. Cilley, of New Hampshire, who, you remember was killed in a duel at Washington. That letter was written to the father of his deceased fellow member, and it expresses the same kindness and regard for his fellows which you would expect from a boy who grew up from the youth which Judge Cross has pictured to us. Mr. Cilley, Brother Cilley, alumnus of the class of 1863, has that letter in his possession, and I should like to have him produce it and read it to this gathering.

Mr. Horatio Gates Cilley, '63: It is indeed true that my brother and myself have this letter in our possession, but on this trip I was obliged to come by way of White River Junction, and I have not the original with me. With your permission I have turned the letter over to Dr. Cilley of Boston, of the class of '68, who will read it to you.

Dr. Orren George Cilley, A. M., '68: We have been hearing for the last two hours about the meritorious acts of Daniel Webster, his peculiarities, his habits, his law, his oratory, and, in fact, of everything that is

good. Still no one that I have heard has said anything in particular about his large and generous heart. They have not said anything of the time when he was in his home, when his mind recurred to those people, friends who were in trouble, and how he sat down and wrote them letters, the like of which I will read to you. I have in my pocket the original of the letter. It is badly broken and I will with your permission read a copy of it.

Dr. Cilley then read a typewritten copy of the original letter.

Dr. Fabez Baxter Upham, A. M., '49.

(Prepared for the occasion but not spoken.)

Although without any personal acquaintance with Mr. Webster, it has been my good fortune to have seen and heard him in some of his most eloquent and powerful speeches.

The first occasion of this kind which I recall was in the autumn of 1840, at Orford in this state, in the memorable campaign of Harrison and Tyler—"Of Tippecanoe and Tyler too," as we boys used to phrase it in our college songs. There was great enthusiasm amongst us at that time, for, then as now, a very large majority of the students of the College were on the side of the Whigs, as the party was termed. It would be called the Republican party to-day, I suppose.

The morning, as I remember it, dawned fair and clear—one of those typical October days of which this favored region has its full complement. The whole College was early astir, and, with appropriate mottoes and banners, prepared themselves to march, by classes,

along the dusty road to the scene of action fifteen miles away. The sun waxed hot as the day wore on, and the march was a weary one; but, in accordance with the spirit of the time, there were plenty of refreshments and hard cider in abundance proffered us by the hospitable inhabitants on the route—for those were the days when "log cabin and hard cider" was the party cry. I do not know how the faculty and the honored head of the College would regard it now, but it was then deemed the patriotic and proper thing to imbibe freely of that beverage, in order to show our loyalty to the presidential candidate.

As to the speech—well I must confess that the majority of us were too weary and exhausted by the long march, and its unwonted accompaniments, to have given such heed to it as we ought. As I recall it, it was a masterly exposition of the principles which pervaded and governed the party in whose interest it was pronounced.

Mr. Everett has said, in his biographical memoir, that, during this canvass of 1840—which he designates as the most strenuous ever witnessed in the United States,—Mr. Webster gave himself up for months to what might literally be called the arduous labors of the field. . . . Not only in Massachusetts and in New Hampshire, but in distant places, ranging from Albany to Richmond, his voice of encouragement and exhortation was heard.

I have sought in vain for any written or printed record of this speech, and of the many others spoken by Mr. Webster during that campaign, but have failed to find them; and I doubt if they were ever reported by

the press. But, whatever may have been the scope and substance of this particular speech, I shall never forget the impression made upon me, as I saw and felt, for the first time, the mighty presence of the man.

No one, in signifying the speeches of Mr. Webster, can fail to allude to his great argument in reply to Hayne, made in the United States Senate in 1830, wherein he darkly prophesied the approach of the irrepressible conflict which, thirty years later, involved the country in Civil War.

I was not old enough then, if you can credit the assertion, to have taken in understandingly the scope and power of that memorable speech, if I had been present at its delivery, which I was not.

I well remember that my honored father, who was a friend and ardent admirer of Mr. Webster, once said to me, in one of my college vacations, "My boy, it has been my custom in every return of the anniversary of that speech, to take down my copy of the *National Intelligencer*, which contains it, and read it through from beginning to end, and I advise you to do the same as long as you live." I regret to say that, in this as in so many other instances, I have failed to follow his wise counsel.

I may be permitted to relate here an incident that befell me personally, having some relation to that speech. When in Charleston, S. C., some twelve or fifteen years ago, I visited the Ancient Church of St. Michael, in that city, and, falling in with the venerable sexton, who had been connected with the church in that capacity for half a century and more, and who seemed to be a part of the structure itself, I strolled out

under his guidance, into the adjacent churchyard. While wandering about among the old graves, my eye rested on a tomb bearing the inscription,

“ ROBERT Y. HAYNE,”

with the date of his birth and death. Being struck by the fact that he died at an age when he might be supposed to be in the full possession of his powers, I inquired of my cicerone the cause of his comparatively early death. Drawing himself up, and looking me full in the face, he replied,

“He died of Webster’s speech, sir.”

Another opportunity I had of hearing Mr. Webster at his best, was at the dinner given to him by the Association of the Sons of New Hampshire resident in Massachusetts, in November, 1849. This took place in the large hall over the Fitchburg R. R. depot in Boston. The vast auditorium was crowded to its utmost capacity. Mr. Webster, who was president of the Association, presided also at the feast. I happened to be one of the marshals on that occasion, and my place was on the floor immediately in front of the speaker. Mr. Webster made two speeches during the evening, one of which has been termed his *Kossuth Speech*, wherein he arraigned, in scathing words, the then Emperor of Russia for his demand on the Sultan of Turkey that the noble Kossuth and his companions be delivered up to be dealt with at his pleasure.

Those who heard him will never forget those burning words, when, rising to the full height of his majestic personality, he said, “Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic powers. The lightning has its power and the whirlwind has its power,

and the earthquake has its power ; but there is something among men more capable of shaking despotic thrones than lightning, whirlwind, or earthquake, and that is the aroused and excited indignation of the whole civilized world. The Emperor of Russia," he continued, "is the supreme lawgiver in his own realms, and, for aught I know, he is the executor of that law, also. But, thanks be to God, he is not the supreme lawgiver and executor of national law, and every offence against that is an offence against the rights of the civilized world."

The effect of this impassioned outburst of eloquence was overwhelming. The whole vast audience rose to its feet as one man, and the acclamations and applause which followed, loud and long-continued, seemed as though it would raise the very roof of the building.

As to the famous Seventh of March Speech, so-called, I did not hear it, but I have read it many times, and have studied it attentively, and I, for one, do not see how Mr. Webster could consistently with the whole course and conduct of his life, have done otherwise than take just the stand he then did. Commenting on that important speech, an eminent authority has justly said, "It is believed that, by the majority of patriotic and reflecting citizens in every part of the United States it has been regarded as holding out a basis for the adjustment of controversies which had already gone far to dissolve the Union, and could not much farther be pursued without producing that result." Mr. Webster saw the difficulties incident to the step he had adopted, and knew full well the risk to his political fortunes which he incurred by his utterances, but he believed that,

unless some such step was taken in the North, the separation of the States was inevitable. What he then foresaw, many of those here present have lived to experience and to know.

In his speech at his reception on Boston Common in the summer of 1852, in evident allusion to his Seventh of March Speech, which has caused so much discussion, and dissension, and contention, both among his friends and his enemies, Mr. Webster uttered these memorable words, "My manner of political life is known to you all . . . I leave it to my country and to the world whether it will or will not stand the test of time and truth." This was spoken on the ninth day of July, 1852, and, so far as I know, it was the last utterance he ever made in public. A little more than three months afterwards he passed away. It was my melancholy privilege, at the head of a thousand of the Sons of New Hampshire, to join in the funeral march of that vast concourse of his fellow citizens of the city of Boston, which thronged its streets and crowded its thoroughfares, to manifest their grief and sorrow at his death.

Once before, in the century which has just closed, I have been permitted to participate in a great centennial celebration of our beloved *Alma Mater*. I allude, of course, to the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the College; and I am one of the very few of the survivors of those who were gathered on the platform on that memorable occasion. I am now nearing the time when, in the course of Nature, I may expect to go down into my not unwelcome grave; but I thank God that I am spared to behold the rising sun of this auspicious day, on which the head of our most distinguished

alumnus, and greatest among the Sons of New Hampshire, is encircled with the halo of a hundred years. It is a day never to be forgotten in the annals of the College; and when that corner-stone, which has just been laid with so much pomp and ceremony, and the imposing structure which is to be reared upon it, shall have crumbled to dust, the memory of this first centennial anniversary of the graduation of our illustrious brother will still be green.—The light of this day shall shine along the pathway of the ages, so long as time endures.

The Chairman: There is another alumnus, I hope, here present to-day, who, I know, is full of information about Mr. Webster, who has been a life-long admirer of him, and who has heard and seen him many times. If Mr. Senter, of the class of '48, is in the Chapel, will he be kind enough to come to the platform?

The Reverend Oramel Stevens Senter, '48.

I could wish, dear brethren and alumni, and invited guests, that I had come before you in a very different state of health. It was very doubtful whether I could come at all, but the attraction was so great once more to meet friends of Dartmouth College on the old camping ground, that my physician said, "I think you can go. It may do you good."

My first view of Mr. Webster was in 1840 at the convention that my friend presiding refers to. I formed a very different opinion of Mr. Webster's address at that time. It was a cool day in the last of September or the early days of October, and he kept his hat on. Almost anything was dignified in Mr. Webster, even the big

brass buttons and the hat and buff trousers, but you remember it is not every man that can be a Webster. He made very few gestures on that occasion. He made a plain, cogent, logical statement of the principles and policy of the great Whig party. A nobler party never existed in this country; it had in it the brightest minds and the best men that America ever produced; it was then in its glory. Mr. Webster first stated the principles of the party clearly, and then referred to the Democratic party, and Silas Wright's great feat at Watertown. I remember it as if it were yesterday, as the best authority in regard to the real principles of the Democratic party.

Mr. Webster was not a man that wasted powder on any occasion. He suited the charge to the game before him. It was only on great and exciting occasions like the Dartmouth Case, and in the reply to Hayne that he was wrought up to so high a pitch as to indulge in flights of oratory; but when he did rise, it was like the crest of the wave; you could no more check it than you could check the rising tide in the ocean.

The next time I saw him was in 1843, I think here in Hanover. There were Webster, Choate, Chase, Amos Kendall, and I think Thaddeus Stevens, while various distinguished gentlemen who were not graduates were invited. I had not entered college then, for I was a sub-freshman, expecting to be a freshman at some time. I said to my companion, "I wish to go and get a look at Daniel Webster"; I had heard him called the Godlike Daniel, and I wanted to see whether his looks warranted such a designation, and so we went and there we sat. I shall never forget it. There was Choate with his

raven black hair and stoop shoulders and eyes that were rather dim, when they looked as if they were dim with thought and genius, shades of grand personal appearance and stately head, almost equal to any man's except Webster's; Woodbury, a fine looking man; George P. Marsh, a man of fine personal physique and good bearing. Then presently there came along a large man, not very corpulent, but of full habit, with deep chest and broad shoulders and with a high forehead and with such eyes as I have said no man ever had but Daniel Webster. And his step was so firm though dignified, without any affectation with it, that it seemed to me that the earth was not solid enough for that solid man. I turned to my companion and said, "This is the only *man* in this vast throng containing so much talent and all that is brilliant and honored by the College and the country; this must be Daniel Webster."

I have felt, gentlemen, that all we could do in regard to reminiscences is just to gather up a few fragments. And certainly nothing is unimportant pertaining to the great statesman, orator, and forensic and diplomatic reasoner, one who possessed, perhaps, the noblest body of all that were ever created on this continent or any other. How much more truly, then, may it be said of him than of the man described by Sheridan, of whom it was said, "God broke the die, the mould, in moulding Webster." No wonder that the citizens of Boston called him the Godlike Daniel. I heard him at another time referred to by Mr. Harvey when Faneuil Hall that had witnessed his most eloquent and most patriotic expressions in favor of liberty, when Faneuil Hall was denied him. The city authorities were afraid

that some of those rabid and raving abolitionists would have it, and so they refused it to Daniel Webster, but the people became so aroused and raised such a hubbub around the ears of the authorities that they went to Mr. Webster and ate humble pie; and he made them eat it, large doses of it. How unlike Mr. Webster, but he made them eat large doses of it, and then, when they offered him the hall, he curtly declined and stood back on his dignity. Harvey tells us all that, but he does not give us the sequel. He says that Mr. Webster stopped several days at the Revere House. So he did. There he made a very interesting address, which I heard. The people somehow got word of it. I don't know how they were notified of it, but an immense throng filled Bowdoin Square so that they had to have a large squad of police there in order to keep order. They had erected a temporary balcony at the corner of the Revere House. This was on the twenty-second of April, 1851, just one year and a month, or a little more, after the Seventh of March Speech. Of course we all expected to hear some allusion to that, but we went away entirely disappointed on that point. Mr. Webster was in a happy mood. I took down his exordium, about a dozen lines, and, perhaps, I can read them: "Fellow citizens, as I come before you on this bright and beautiful morning, with the glorious sun gilding with his first rays our steeples and housetops and clothing the earth with warmth and cheerfulness, I feel very happy, and if all before me are as happy as the speaker there must be a great amount of happiness in this vast concourse of people."

Now I shall refer to an incident connected with the famous silver vase. In 1835, Mr. Webster made reply to Hayne. He had also made another very important speech in reply to the Calhoun doctrine in 1833, and various other speeches, on the banking question and other topics. Thus it was that the citizens of Boston thought it would be very desirable to call Webster out to make a speech on those topics. They went ahead and gathered funds, no man being allowed to contribute more than one dollar towards the purchase of a silver vase to be presented to Mr. Webster. After having been so secured it was presented to him with interesting formalities. A Mr. Gray made the speech, or address of presentation, and Mr. Webster replied to it very much at length. Later the original donors made a gift of that vase to the Library authorities in Boston on the express condition that it should be kept where the greatest possible number of people could see it, and it was placed in the old Public Library where it could be seen. I recently employed a young man to look the matter up, and it turns out that the vase has been taken to the new Boston Public Library, where it is hidden away where nobody can see it.

Now, I hope before this meeting breaks up that it will be resolved that it is the intent and desire of the Dartmouth alumni that that vase shall be brought out of its hiding place and that it shall be suitably inscribed and placed in some public position, where it may be seen, for the admiration of the citizens. There is one comical incident connected with this matter which I will relate. When it was given to Webster, there was an old resident of my native village, Thetford, a first-

class business man who grew rich at his trade as a tanner. He came into the village store one day and announced with great wonder and emphasis, "What do you think; the citizens of Boston have presented Daniel Webster with a silver vest!" Somebody in the crowd said, "Why, Mr. Ansey, are n't you mistaken? Isn't it a silver vase?" "No doubt," he said, "it must be that. I have no doubt I was mistaken." This same gentleman came into the store and said that he read that Harry Clay and Theodore Frelinghunter had been nominated.

I have said that some resolution should be passed that it is the desire and opinion of the assembly of the alumni of Dartmouth College that that interesting relic and historic article shall be brought out and placed in some conspicuous position where all the citizens of Boston and all the friends of that library can have the best possible opportunity of seeing it, and of seeing the inscriptions which are upon it. I thank you, gentlemen, for the attention you have given to the very broken remarks I have made. I will not detain you longer.

The Chairman: Following down in the order of seniority, I have here on my list the name of a brother classmate, Dr. Foster, of '49. I know that Dr. Foster has at least one reminiscence of Daniel Webster, for he has often recounted it to me. It was of the, I will not say impulse, I don't know that I ought to say inspiration, but it was something very positive that he once derived from Daniel Webster's boot. I will ask Dr. Foster, of the class of '49, if he can give us any experience or reminiscence.

The Reverend Davis Foster, D. D., '49.

Brethren and Friends :

I have heard specimens of moving oratory, but I think nothing has been quite so moving as the incident which I will relate to you. In 1847, Daniel Webster came up to Lebanon and gave an address at the opening of the Northern Railroad. We college boys went down to hear him as was very natural. We sat on the platform, a half dozen of us, with our legs hanging over—a not very dignified attitude. There was a great congregation present, four or five thousand people, and when Mr. Webster came forward to speak, we whispered among ourselves, “Now, we will touch some part of his clothing, or we will touch something connected with Webster.” And we put our hands upon his boots. They were coarse, cowhide boots, such as men wore in those times, not fancy slippers, but simply cowhide boots.

Among our number was a Mr. Doe. Well, the Doe happened to be thin leavened at that time. It had not risen, but the touch of Mr. Webster's cowhide boot proved very efficacious in the life of Chief Justice Doe of New Hampshire. Mr. Doe began to rise. He continued to rise and forty years after, when we met at our fortieth anniversary, Mr. Doe was, perhaps, in some respects the equal of any citizen of New Hampshire as a jurist and as a judge. His name had been mentioned for the office of Chief Justice of the United States. He was a man of mark. Mr. Doe had risen and he made a full sized loaf of bread. I said to Judge Doe, “Mr. Doe, it did you more good than all the rest of us to touch Mr. Webster's boot.” The rest of us never attained eminence. We went on doing a common sort of

work, and we had good men in the class. My friend, the president of this occasion, did rise. But we, none of us, rose as Mr. Doe rose. And none of us have been harmed by it, but it did Doe a wonderful amount of good. From that time he began to rise and continued to rise as long as he lived.

The Chairman : We have often been told the powerful incentive to action there was in an animated pair of boots. Especially if they were, as my old classmate says those boots were, cowhide boots. I can only regret that I was not on that platform. I got no touch of them myself. I have been advised that Mr. Joseph Story of Boston, a nephew of Chief Justice Story, is here, and remembers some things personally about Mr. Webster. We shall be very glad to hear from Mr. Story.

Mr. Joseph Story.

The Chairman has asked me the year of my class. I have been in the habit of visiting Hanover, and happening to be in Hanover I came here to-day. I came to Hanover to visit a friend of mine and to enjoy the two days of celebration in honor of this distinguished American. I have been asked a number of times during my visit if I were connected with Dartmouth College, or a graduate of Dartmouth. "Well," I said jocosely, "yes, I have been through Dartmouth." I took the opportunity one day to go into the front door of, it seems to me, this building and go through the rooms of the College and out of the rear door, so that I may say that I have been through Dartmouth College and save any further explanations. I do

not feel that I have any place here, friends, only as one of the humble American citizens who have delighted to know that Daniel Webster, so distinguished throughout the world, was an American citizen.

Reference has been made to the Whig party. I was cradled in that party. My childhood was rocked in the Whig cradle, and of course I began to live hearing of Daniel Webster, and in quite a number of days in my childhood, his name, his labors, and his fame were called to my attention. As a little boy I remember the scenes of the courtroom in the case of the murder of Joseph Pike of Salem. He was a connection. The case was much talked of in the family. I remember the exciting circumstances, how the vigilance committee was appointed, and how they labored month after month, and month after month without finding any clue to that terrible tragedy, but at last, I think it was after about two years, it came by accident, revealed by one who had been offered a sum of money two years before to keep to himself his knowledge. He wrote to one of the Knox boys a letter asking them—the boys who hired Crowninshield to commit that murder—that they should send him money, two or three hundred dollars that had been offered him if he would keep closed lips. It went to Salem to the son. The son had the same name as his father, and he turned it over to his father who was one of the vigilance committee. And that father felt that it was his duty to the people of Salem that he should give to them that letter.

The results you know, and the words of Webster in that trial, tracing up from the time the murderer entered the house until the transaction was closed. But

the orator of the day omitted the statement that during the trial Crowninshield committed suicide in prison, and that Mr. Webster, referring to it, uttered that sentence that has been so well known in legal quotations—"There is no escape but suicide, and suicide is confession."

There is one thing that I wish I had with me, a little paper, a poem written by Mr. Webster in his younger life over the death of a dear young son of great promise. I haven't it, but it shows that touch of nature, that not only as a great man he mingled with great men, not only as a great man he knew no person too humble for his association; but it brought out from a father's heart, from the heart of that great man, an utterance in language so simple and tender that I know every mother and every father present here to-day would feel that his lament over the loss of a son revealed the same tenderness that they felt when they laid a little boy of promise, upon whom they had set their hearts, away in the grave.

During the times that I have been here it has been a pleasure to visit your art gallery. Reference has been made a number of times to the reply of Webster to Hayne. That scene is delineated upon canvas, as you know, in Faneuil Hall in Boston, and Mr. Webster stands there, the prominent person upon the canvas. If any of you wish to know how Mr. Webster looked when he spoke, aside from anything that has been said here, go for yourselves into that gallery and look there at the statue by Thomas Ball, in my judgment the best of any that I have ever seen (his bust and his statue reveal the lineaments of Mr. Webster as well as they can

be portrayed in bronze or clay or plaster), and then imagine him standing up in the Senate of the United States. Look at that plaster, clothe it with raiment, put into the face the color of the skin and to the eyes, those great lustrous eyes, the elements of life, and then with ears that shall be quick to hear unheard sounds, listen to his voice and imagine that you were there, and you have a picture of Mr. Webster as the orator, the senator, the great man among his fellows.

Did he want to be President? I know something about the campaign, though I was small at the time. Did he want to be President? Suppose he did. Was n't he fit for it? Was there ever a man in our country that had stood before our people, advocating the questions that should bring to our country the highest type of civilization, of industrial interest, of business prosperity and happiness for the people; was there ever any one who had ever done it to a greater extent than Mr. Webster? Well might he wish it. Well might he have wished the Presidency. Men wish to be selectmen, to be common councillors, men wish to be aldermen, or representatives, or senators. He was certainly gifted for the Presidency, and I am thankful to-day that the gentleman who has spoken so eloquently to us, the Honorable Mr. McCall, has given to us such an oration connected with the life of Mr. Webster and the elements in his character. He covered the same ground that others had covered, but he went a step further, and turned over some of the other pages that had not been so much referred to. I was glad that he did it, because I think that he did it well. I know how bitterly the people felt toward Mr. Webster—many who had been his

friends—when he delivered that March address. But I had heard from some of his associates what the feeling of Webster was when he delivered that speech, he who had been the expounder and the defender of the Constitution of the United States, whose sentiments had always been noble, who was the idol, worshiped by a great and prosperous party.

I believe that Mr. Webster felt as his friends claimed for him when he said that before them stood the picture of a country rent asunder, one nation at the south, another nation at the north, with no prospect of union; that rather than to carry out any particular policy at that time he would rather bide for the time to come when those questions that had been troublesome should be settled without bloodshed, without war, without a broken and disunited country. All this, I think, has been proved since that time. Ah, from the very ramparts of Heaven, that man who stood and spoke as he did, with a prophet's eye looking into the future saw signs at that time when the discussion of those questions were uppermost; he saw signs that we were then on the verge of one of the bloodiest wars the world had ever seen or ever would see, when our sons and fathers and brothers, north and south, should mingle their blood with the mother Earth.

It was a prophetic eye, I believe, and I believe it was to guard against that fate that Mr. Webster spoke with prophetic thought, fearing the things that did come to us. But I thank God that that man who has done so much for his country and must have had his heart grieved, if they are conscious in that other world of the things that transpire here in this world, is now looking

down upon the nation that he loved, upon the country for which he labored, this chain of states from the Gulf to the line of Canada united in an equal bond.

It is not proper for me to occupy your time at this hour with my feelings about Mr. Webster, and I thank every man who has said a kind word for him, and I thank you that you have permitted me to say just these few words, coming as I did without the least intention of taking any part in any celebration except to rejoice with you. It has been a grand time. Accept my thanks.

The Chairman : The hour grows late, much more time than we have to spare could be given to recalling these interesting reminiscences, but we cannot agree to dissolve this meeting till we have heard of the last loving tribute paid the dead statesman by his friends and neighbors. A brother alumnus is present who was one of the committee of his class to attend Daniel Webster's funeral—Mr. Runnels of '53 will tell us his experiences in the performance of that duty—a duty which a half century ago this College thought might be the last tribute of respect it would ever have opportunity to pay to the memory of her greatest son.

The Reverend Moses Thurston Runnels, A. M., '53.

Fellow Alumni and Friends of Dartmouth :

I shall take scarcely more than five minutes of your valuable time this afternoon. I trust you will excuse the egotism of an old alumnus who finds himself on this occasion one among the very few who were students in the College when our immortal Webster breathed his last, and the only one among the students

here present who was permitted to attend his funeral at Marshfield.

I well recall the impression which the not unexpected intelligence of Mr. Webster's death made upon us as a body of students. We had been having a very heated political campaign for several weeks before that, of Scott versus Pierce in 1852. I remember having climbed the lightning rod to the top of the dome of Dartmouth Hall and to have held my classmate Burnett while standing up on my shoulders so that he might fasten our Scott flag nearer to the weather vane than the Pierce flag had previously been raised. Many were the political gatherings and the political speeches which we had been hearing or trying to make, but when the news of Mr. Webster's demise came to us on or soon after the twenty-fourth day of October, a sudden hush, a deep solemnity fell upon us like a pall.

Politics were entirely dropped. The students met as a body in this Chapel. Our revered teachers with the venerable Dr. Lord at their head—all now gone to their reward—spoke to us fitting words, after which two delegates from each class were chosen to attend the funeral of the departed statesman. Our friend, Alpheus Benning Crosby, the genial Dr. Ben of after years, was selected with me to represent the senior class. The late lamented Dr. Henry R. Hazen was a delegate from the class of 1854, and my impression is, though I am not quite certain, that Walbridge A. Field, afterwards Chief Justice of Massachusetts, and John M. Chamberlain, a clergyman of later years in Minnesota, represented the class of 1855.

Before this I had been a very studious youth. Not a mark for three years had been set against my name on the monitor's bills, and I was so anxious not to break the record that I hesitated about accepting the appointment. But my excellent uncle, Dr. Albert Smith, of the medical faculty, charged me by all means to do so. Said he, "You will hereafter look back upon it as one of the highest honors of your life to have attended the funeral of Mr. Webster." I therefore donned my first black stovepipe hat, the only one I have ever worn, and proceeded to Marshfield with the rest.

But who can adequately picture that scene! The people of Massachusetts poured into Marshfield by thousands, not only from his own Congressional district, which we are told once gave Mr. Webster every vote but one to return him to Congress, but from all parts of the state and from other portions of New England. Steamboats were carried up from Boston to Duxbury, and other adjacent harbors. Train after train went up to the nearest station on the Old Colony Railroad while all the old neighbors of Mr. Webster, the sturdy farmers of Marshfield and its vicinity, in whose agricultural affairs he had taken so deep an interest, were there in a body. Several of these were his chosen bearers, and I remember to have seen them sitting with tearful eyes beside his bier.

Mr. Webster's body was dressed in his citizen's suit just as he used to appear in Boston, and was laid upon a raised open casket. The last picture we saw upon the screen last evening well answered to his face as he appeared in death, only with closed eyes, while the massive forehead and deeply arched eyebrows made

us all feel it was the most magnificent face and form that we had ever gazed upon in the embrace of death. I had never seen Mr. Webster in life, but his mortal part in death left an impression upon my mind which only the glories of eternity can efface. For an hour or two the masses filed by to take their last lingering look of that Godlike form and countenance. The Reverend Mr. Alden, then the young pastor of the Marshfield church, by Mr. Webster's request, conducted the services and was the only one who spoke at his funeral. The procession which followed his remains was so large that it seemed necessary to take quite a circuitous route to the place of burial. Sadly we marched along to the music of that grand requiem of Beethoven, which has since borne the name of "Webster's Funeral March." As we were thus passing to the tomb, I well remember that the sun for the first time on that day shone out brightly from the dull and mournful clouds which had hung over us during the preceding hours.

Behind me in the procession was an elderly gentleman who quoted, as we slowly wended our way, a paragraph of Webster's phillipic against Hayne. He further said that he himself was present in the Senate chamber when that speech was delivered, and that the sun then beamed into the chamber lighting up the very spot where Mr. Webster was standing near the close of that address, as he uttered those undying words: "When my eyes shall be turned to behold for the last time, the sun in heaven, may I not see him shining on the broken and dishonored fragments of a once glorious Union; on States dissevered, discordant, belligerent; on a land rent with civil feuds, or drenched it may be, in

fraternal blood ! Let their last feeble and lingering glance, rather, behold the gorgeous ensign of the republic bearing not these words of delusion and folly, ' Liberty first and Union afterwards' ; but that other sentiment, dear to every true American heart—' Liberty *and* Union, now and forever, one and inseparable ! ' "

The Chairman : Gentlemen, we have now performed the last duty, paid the last tribute that the alumni of Dartmouth College can at this time present to the memory of their great fellow alumnus. What shall follow this evening will be rather in the light of hilarity and festivity proper to any centennial celebration, but this meeting for reminiscence this afternoon was forced to take on somewhat of a more sober character. I congratulate you and myself that we have heard so much that has been of interest and that this description of his final laying away has been so graphically told. May the recollections of this occasion be prized in all the future which is before us. Our duty is now ended : as we go hence may we say of our illustrious Webster with bowed heads and with loving, reverent hearts, "*Requiescat in pace.*"

Program.

The Centennial closed with a banquet, followed by speeches from distinguished alumni and guests of the College. The new and stately dining hall in College Hall was at this time put to its first public use. At 7:30 o'clock the hall was filled to its utmost capacity with trustees, faculty, alumni, and guests of the College. The gallery was reserved for ladies in attendance at the Centennial.

Banquet.

Following the banquet the President of the College introduced the guests of the evening :

His Excellency the Governor of New Hampshire.

Edwin Webster Sanborn, Esquire, '78.

Professor Francis Brown, LL. D., '70.

The Honorable David Cross, LL. D., '41.

The Honorable William Everett, LL. D.

The Reverend Edward Everett Hale, LL. D.

The Honorable George Frisbie Hoar, LL. D.

Chief Justice Melville Weston Fuller, LL. D.

The Webster Centennial Banquet.

THE dining hall was hung with portraits. At the head of the hall were those of Mr. Webster, with one exception in possession of the College; the "Black Dan" picture, painted by Francis Alexander and presented to the College by Dr. G. C. Shattuck, 1803; the painting by T. A. Lawson, the gift of John Aiken, Esquire, 1814, and others; the Ames portrait,

painted by Joseph Ames and presented to the College by Dr. J. B. Upham, 1842 ; the Marshfield portrait, painted at Marshfield in 1848 by Emery Seaman and presented to the College by Lewis G. Farmer, Esquire, 1872 ; and the portrait by Gilbert Stuart, loaned by the Honorable George Fred Williams, 1872.

On either side were portraits of some of the counsel who were associated with Mr. Webster in the Dartmouth College Case : Jeremiah Smith and Jeremiah Mason, who appeared with Mr. Webster before the State Court ; Levi Woodbury, of the New Hampshire Bench ; Joseph Hopkinson, who, with Mr. Webster, carried the case before the Supreme Court of the United States ; and Ichabod Bartlett of the opposing counsel.

There were also hung about the room portraits of the founder, early presidents, distinguished graduates, and benefactors of the College. Among these there was a draped portrait of the Honorable Frank Palmer Goulding of the class of 1863, who was to have spoken at the banquet, but who died only a few days before the Centennial.

When the procession had entered and all had been seated under the direction of the Marshal, divine blessing was asked by Professor Francis Brown, LL. D., '70. During the banquet the College Orchestra furnished music. The speaking which followed was interspersed with selections by the Glee Club.

At the close of the banquet Colonel Darling called the assembly to order with a bell, which he stated had been owned and used by Mr. Webster in his home in Franklin. He also announced that through the courtesy of the Boston and Maine railroad the special train for

Boston would be held until one hour after the close of the exercises.

Introductory Words of the Presiding Officer.

Brethren of the Alumni, Ladies and Gentlemen, and our honored Guests:—

REGRET that my opening word must be a word of apology. It was far from my intention to preside at this dinner. At the very outset an invitation was extended to the Honorable Alfred Russell of the class of 1850, to serve as toastmaster, in recognition of his eminent fitness for this service. He had accepted the invitation, and had confidently expected to be with us until within a few days. A special session of the Supreme Court of Michigan, fixed for this very date, detains him at Detroit. As it falls to me to play the part of host for the College throughout this Centennial occasion I have been impressed by the committee of arrangements into Mr. Russell's place. It is not my duty to make his speech; only to discharge the more formal functions of his office.

There is but one word which I can speak in my capacity as host with perhaps greater fitness than Mr. Russell, the simple word of welcome. I bid you welcome, brethren of the alumni, you who have come hither in your gratitude and in your pride. I welcome you to the full enjoyment of your honorable and inspiring fellowship. I welcome you also to the high task of making the College more worthy of the man and of the event which we celebrate. I bid you welcome, repre-

sentatives of the state of New Hampshire, and you our neighbors of the state of Massachusetts, who are with us on this occasion by virtue of a common inheritance and of a common affection. I bid you welcome, our most distinguished guests, who have graciously counted it an honor to join with us in this revival of the fame of Mr. Webster.

I have before me letters of regret from many whose presence would have added greatly to the enjoyment and to the distinction of this gathering. The following I will read in full or in part :

ESKADALE, BEAULY, SCOTLAND, Aug. 27, 1901.

Lord Dartmouth regrets extremely that important engagements in England will prevent his visiting America this autumn. He must therefore regretfully decline the invitation of the President and Trustees of Dartmouth College to attend the celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster, a ceremony which had it been possible, he would much have liked to witness.

WOOD LEE, VIRGINIA WATER, September 2, 1901.

Dear Mr. President :—

I regret very much that I shall be unable to avail myself of the invitation extended by the President and Trustees of Dartmouth College to be present on so interesting an occasion as that of the celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster.

With renewed regrets, and all good wishes for the continued success and usefulness of the College. Believe me,

Very faithfully yours,

LEVI P. MORTON.

The President of Dartmouth College.

NEWBURY, N. H., August 3, 1901.

Dear Dr. Tucker :—

I have received your kind letter of the 30th of July and I am, of course, deeply sensible of the compliment involved in the invitation. It is however out of my power to avail myself of your courtesy. I am engaged at the request of the President in keeping up the current

business of the State Department, which I can do by dividing my time between this place and Washington. But I am unable to make any engagements for any other purpose.

I am most grateful to you for your kind letter and wish that I could answer differently.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN HAY.

NORTH CONWAY, N. H., September 5, 1901.

The President and Faculty of Dartmouth College.

Gentlemen :—

To accept your courteous invitation to join in the September festivities of our venerable and distinguished College would give me very real gratification. And I would certainly be with you then were I in New England. But, unfortunately for me, I must the last week in this month be well on my way to San Francisco. There I have throughout October, duties of a serious nature which I cannot possibly put aside.

I am sure that the old College will gather many of her sons; and what college can rejoice in a body of alumni, at once more loyal than they of Dartmouth, or made up of stronger men! Not one.

To all who value a sound and large education, and who care that New Hampshire do share in all best things, the sound, prosperous condition of the College is a cause of much gladness.

And with all warmest good wishes, I am, Gentlemen,

With greatest respect. Very truly yours,

WILLIAM W. NILES.

To the President and Trustees of Dartmouth College.

Gentlemen :—

I have the honor to express my gratification at receiving your invitation to participate in the celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster. It would afford me the greatest pleasure to be with you on that occasion, did not my age and naturally waning strength forbid. His glorious head inspired me in my first work in clay, the first stroke of my chisel, afforded me the first success in my profession, and therefore is heartily and gratefully remembered by me.

I will only add a passing thought,

On that sad night, when he departed,

Ere his great spirit fled :

Three words he murmured ; then 'twas whispered,
"He is dead."

Not so ! He's with you in your meeting,
His benison to give ;
And—though you may not hear—repeating
"I still live !"

Respectfully and truly yours.

THOMAS BALL.

MONTCLAIR, N. J., Aug. 20, 1901.

LAWRENCE PARK, BRONXVILLE, N. Y., September 2d, 1901.

WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER, D. D., LL. D.,

President of Dartmouth College.

Dear Sir :—

My respect and affection for Dartmouth, at whose hands I received my first honorary degree not conferred by my *Alma Mater*, make me always grateful for her remembrance ; and I am now honored by the invitation of her President and Trustees to attend the celebration of the Centennial Anniversary of the graduation of Daniel Webster.

It is with more than conventional regret that I find myself unable to visit Dartmouth upon so notable an occasion. With the great names of Webster, Choate, and Chase upon the roll of her graduates, she can indeed in Lowell's words,

"—cling forever

In her grand old mountain rest,"
and proudly breast the upper air.

I am, with much respect,

Very truly yours,

EDMUND C. STEDMAN.

HARLAKENDEN HOUSE, CORNISH, August 31, 1901.

My Dear Dr. Tucker :—

I regret exceedingly that I shall not be able to attend the Webster Centennial, but I shall not be in this part of the country at the time. I am very much disappointed that this is the case, but I have other engagements of long standing which it is impossible to break. I expect to drive to Dartmouth some time this autumn, and shall call and pay my respects and express my regrets to you then. With many thanks, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

Letters have also been received from Chief Justice Isaac Blodgett, Senators Gallinger and Burnham, Assistant Secretary Hackett, Representative Sulloway, the Honorable Stilson Hutchins, the Honorable John D. Lyman, Ex-Senator Dawes, Judge Jeremiah Smith, President Lucius Tuttle, the Honorable George Fred Williams, Chief Justice Holmes, ex-Secretary Olney, Senator W. P. Dillingham, ex-Judge Hoadly and others.

I will read the following letter which lends its own pathos to this occasion. All we have to show for the promise of this letter is an honored memory, and the draped picture which hangs upon the wall.

POLAND SPRING HOUSE, SOUTH POLAND, ME.

REV. W. J. TUCKER, HANOVER, N. H.

My Dear Dr. Tucker:—

Your invitation to speak at the banquet, September 25th, on Mr. Webster at the Massachusetts bar was forwarded here, and I have just received it. I thank you very much for the honor, and am happy to accept. Hoping that the celebration may be all we desire, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK P. GOULDING.

In the absence, however, of many who would have been with us to-night had it been possible, we have a princely gathering. I will not withhold your attention from those whose fame has brought you around these tables. In the letter of Mr. Russell to Judge Richardson explaining his absence he gave this chance definition of a toastmaster, "The toastmaster resembles the whetstone mentioned by Horace which does no cutting itself; but brings out the sharpness of the blades of others." Accepting this definition I proceed at once to touch the edge of the blades around me.

And first of all I am about to present to you the Governor of the State of New Hampshire. The relation of the State to the College is very different from that which obtained at the time which is brought to mind by events which will doubtless be referred to this evening. The Dartmouth College Case bore the legal title, "The Trustees of Dartmouth College vs. William H. Woodward," but the defendant in the case was virtually the State of New Hampshire. It would be unjust, however, to recall this ancient controversy from the side of the College without making the frank acknowledgment that the College invited the interference of the State. As I have had occasion to say elsewhere, the State did not take the initiative. It was, perhaps, for this reason that the breach between the State and the College was so quickly healed after the Federal Court had made its decision. In the present relations between the State and the College no one could suspect that there had ever been alienation or controversy. Each recognizes in growing measure its obligation to the other, and from the side of the State no one has expressed with greater frankness or good will the present indebtedness of the State to the College than the honored guest whom I now present to you, His Excellency the Governor of New Hampshire.

Speech of His Excellency Chester Bradley Jordan, LL.D.

Mr. President :—

EW Hampshire is proud that she was able to give to the nation and the world a character so grand, an intellect so great as to win and hold the admiration of reading, thinking men in all lands for almost a century. Richly endowed by his Creator, fortunate in being well born of loving, sturdy parents who contributed generously of themselves and of their scant means to the education and the culture that well supplemented his massive natural powers, Webster early attracted the attention of our great minds, went to the front rank of lawyers, diplomats, and statesmen, and for half a century in all those fields maintained undisputed primacy. And now at this centennial celebration of his graduation from this renowned seat of learning his work and his name stand forth in matchless brilliancy and in a glory undimmed by the flight of years. History nowhere records greater achievements performed by any man in the civil walks of life than those wrought by this son of the old Granite State as he thought and toiled and wrote and spake to and among his fellow countrymen, unfolding to dim understanding, explaining to obtuse intellects, making plain to carping critics not then over loyal to our form of government, the richness, the fullness and completeness of the Constitution, urging upon all the people the great necessity for adhering to all its provisions in sunshine and in tempest, in war and in peace. With a logic that was irresistible, a reasoning most convincing, a forecast so unerring as to

be prophetic, with appeals eloquent with truth and loyalty he did work for the constitution second to none, and equalled, if equalled at all, only by that of the great Marshall.

But standing here among these Judges, Senators, Members of Congress, Presidents and Professors of Colleges, Doctors of Law, Divinity, and Medicine, grand men in every calling who have spoken and are to speak of him whose virtues we celebrate, in the short time accorded me as Chief Magistrate of Webster's native state, I shall not, must not, undertake to cover any considerable part of the broad field of his activities and usefulness, but rather seek to speak a few words concerning what more distinctively belongs to New Hampshire. I realize that he was the nation's, that he was in every large sense an American citizen hemmed in by no state lines: that all our states have a right to share in his lustrous record, his wonderful career, and his ever increasing fame. Ours, I have said is the place of his birth, the home of his childhood. Ours, too, his parents, his brothers and sisters, his boyhood days, his early struggles in school, his college life, in which he gave abundant promise of the man he became. Ours the deep reverence for father and mother and the loyalty to the interests and wants of all in the old home at Salisbury; ours the all-night conference when he laid bare to Ezekiel his plans and purpose for sending him to College, and ours the tears, and the conflict, too, between desire and apparent duty to themselves and the rest of the household, of that father and mother in that next night's conference as they discussed the question of mortgaging the farm to raise money to educate both

boys; ours that bright morning when the sun broke upon that humble home and found a new radiance, a brighter bow of promise than its inmates had ever before beheld, for all had heard the words of the fond mother,—“Father, I guess we better trust the boys.” Ours the inspiring example of that sublime trust in rugged, noble, aspiring youth, and of unsurpassed filial devotion and care in return; ours the journeys of father and son to Exeter and to Hanover; of son, on that May day as his quarter’s salary was paid him, the first considerable sum of money he ever earned, when with a thrill of joy he never before felt he set out across the country for Hanover and placed it all in Ezekiel’s hands.

This giant of giants, this prince of princes, this man who knew no superior among men as he walked the earth, was by his own fireside sweet and tender as a woman. As his children and wife bent before the storms of life he went deep into the valley of affliction. His mighty hand was soft and gentle as he laid it upon the wounds of suffering humanity. His great heart never failed to bleed at the woes and misfortunes of others.

He kept green and warm his love for his old New Hampshire home and his New Hampshire friends. Every year he made fond pilgrimages to it and to them. He was pleased beyond measure to receive on his birthday letters from his old neighbors. In public and in private he told of the virtues of those from whose loins he sprang. He sang praises to New Hampshire’s beautiful hills, everlasting mountains, to her lakes and her rivers, to the streams that in his boyhood had become so dear to him. With the elder Crawford he climbed our highest mountain. As he reached the top

he said,—“Mt. Washington, I have come a long distance and toiled hard to reach your summit, and now you give me a cold reception. I am extremely sorry that I cannot stay to view this grand prospect which lies before me and nothing prevents but the uncomfortable atmosphere in which you reside.”

His address at the New Hampshire Festival at Boston in November, 1849, is full of affection for home and friends. The keynote of his oration here in Hanover in 1800 was love of country. In his Fourth of July oration at Fryeburg in 1802 he said, “The American Constitution is the purchase of American valor,” and from then to the day of his death he did not cease to urge upon all his countrymen the danger of departing from its teachings.

He loved his *Alma Mater*. In the prime of his superb manhood, in the vigor of his imperial intellect, he pleaded for her until spectators, court, and advocate were in tears, and the decision then reached made the life of this College possible and had more sweeping influence upon such institutions and upon the law of contracts than any other our court had ever pronounced.

Dartmouth does well to commemorate in this becoming manner the graduation from her halls one hundred years ago of the greatest man of the many great men the College and New Hampshire have given to the world. Last February we fittingly observed the hundredth anniversary of John Marshall's advent to the bench of our highest court.

Young men of New Hampshire, look upon the lives of these two men and take new hope, new courage, new inspiration.

President Tucker : In the tribute which we pay to the memory of Daniel Webster it would be a most ungracious neglect if we should fail to recall the name of Ezekiel. Daniel and Ezekiel, brothers indeed, of equal endowment, sharing the same early fortune, and united till death by a love "passing the love of women." I take great pleasure in presenting to you, of direct descent in the collateral branch, Edwin Webster Sanborn Esquire, of the class of 1878.

Speech of Edwin Webster Sanborn, Esquire, '78.

President Tucker, Ladies and Gentlemen :—

INCE our people acquired the habit of centennial celebrations, it has become usual to analyze the event undergoing observance, and to test its value by the permanent results. The present anniversary has thus brought out the service of Mr. Webster to education, which had been overshadowed by the commercial importance of the Dartmouth College decision. Growing out of his attachment to this College, and his faith in the type of culture it represented, it is difficult to speak of the results without frequent reference to Dartmouth.

There was a distant relative of Mr. Webster, a portly and solemn man, who seized the opportunity, whenever visited by his kindred, to furnish, with much detail, an account of his own personal affairs. This he always prefaced with the remark—"I will now do what I seldom do, and talk about myself." This formula, which is said to have appealed to Mr. Webster's sense of

humor, might be used on behalf of the College, which is now receiving its family and friends. Its eminent guests have recognized by their presence the responsibility laid upon Dartmouth by its second founder, and if the College, through its officers or alumni, persists in speaking of itself,—which it does but once in a hundred years,—it is hoped that this may be accepted as the due accounting of its stewardship.

So many years having passed without producing another Webster, it was doubtless wise to concede that his career was not entirely the result of his college life. Yet the recent parade has proved,—after the necessary restorations had been made,—that between the sons of Dartmouth, who are the present ornaments of the Boston bar, and their illustrious predecessor, the difference, after all, is only one of headgear.

In regard to Mr. Webster himself we have been able to show, at least, that Dartmouth was as naturally the Webster college as Kearsarge was the Webster mountain. Kearsarge remains at the old location ; and if the alchemy of nature should give us a second Webster, he would find at Dartmouth the congenial place to develop his genius.

This grows out of the fact that Dartmouth has always been a representative institution of northern New England, being shaped by the same persistent forces which in the case of Mr. Webster were concentrated upon an individual. Of these New England influences the first principle is seriousness. The early attempts to hammer a livelihood from the soil of the Granite State could hardly have been other than a serious employment. The young men of those days came to Hanover

with feelings of respect for labor and reverence for learning. Their sentiment was recognized by an early rule which solved the problem of fitting the punishment to the crime. "No scholar shall speak diminutively of the practice of labor, under penalty of being obliged to perform that which he endeavored to discredit." The letter of this law died as the College grew in dignity, but its spirit has never ceased to haunt us.

A serious rule of conduct, to give the best results, should not be taken too seriously, and it is reassuring to note the robust appearance of our alumni, and to recall no serious case of injury from overwork.

Yet the studious spirit prevails here as far as possible with the male, human animal of collegiate age, and Dartmouth has always remained identified with northern New England. Until recent years, its largest class was that of 1842 ; and as nearly as the date can be fixed, that was the culminating era of the old Puritan New England. After the war, the farmers of this region enjoyed a short return of prosperity. In that era of high prices, they accumulated a little money which they at once began to squander on schools and churches. The effect was seen in the seventies, when the college classes again increased in numbers.

In later years as emigration to the West was renewed, the College began to feel the departure of its patrons and the need of a new departure for itself. It was in those days that a panorama was advertised at Norwich of scenes from Pilgrim's Progress. There was still a strong feeling at Hanover against the influence of the stage ; but this drama was to be presented in a church, and its ethical value was so forcibly urged that

a number of people went over, and were much edified. Toward the close, the slides seemed to move across the stage slowly, and with some difficulty. The final scene was announced as the Grand Transformation, introducing a view of the land of Beulah over the Delectable Mountains. To give the effect of sudden transformation, this canvas was pushed forward quickly, even before the preceding picture—of Giant Despair—had been entirely removed. The heavy slide moved a third of the way across the stage and came to a stop. There were sounds of pushing and lifting, and then a pause. In this expectant hush the proprietor was heard to exclaim, behind the scenes, in husky—but penetrating—tones, “The derned thing won’t go; it needs greasin’.”

The simile is apt if not elegant. In its eventful pilgrimage Dartmouth had reached a point where it needed the push of an active, constructive policy, lubricated by tact and sympathy with affairs. Fortunately this need was supplied. We have kept a section of Maine and the clientage which comes from the easterly watershed of the Green Mountains. Massachusetts—there she stood. We have annexed a large part of her. We have reached out to the West for men of the Dartmouth type. The West is geographically our natural field. In relation to Hanover almost everything is West. As a result, we review the path already trod from the serene heights of the Delectable Mountains. “The past at least is secure.” Looking forward to another Centennial, there will be no misgivings, if the present management consent to remain in charge throughout the coming century.

The most serious criticism of college life is in the charge now current that it breeds extravagance and unfitness for self-reliant work. It is, perhaps, a vice inherent in all liberal culture that it rather fits a man to make the most out of life, than to make the most out of his neighbors. But we may say to the anxious parent—If it be the fate of your son to go through life with the burden of a liberal education, here is where it can be applied in the most innocuous form. Here is a college of which self-reliance is the chief corner-stone; which cultivates not only the humanities, but humanity; which aims at developing not only the scholar, but the man; not only at imparting knowledge, but the power to work it out for one's self, and apply it to the facts of life.

A young man who can acquire habits of extravagance at Hanover is possessed of rare creative genius. The instinct of wholesome economy is one of the legacies from our New England ancestry. Yet it was not their way to grudge expense for true essentials. Look at the list of free public libraries. Of about four hundred, dependent on taxation, Massachusetts has one hundred and seventy-nine; New Hampshire and Illinois coming next with thirty-five each. The rest are all in New England states or states with strong New England influence. New Hampshire is, perhaps, best entitled to the motto—Every man his own Carnegie. The geographical distribution of libraries confirms the suspicion that people send their sons to Dartmouth in close proportion to the general diffusion of knowledge.

For an individual example of the same trait, I would cite Elder Shadrack Spafford, of Beaver Meadow,

who used to visit Hanover. Elder Spafford had been four times married, the amount of household work he was accustomed to exact of his wives not being favorable to conjugal longevity. He happened to be sitting in the store when some one read the statement that in certain benighted parts of India a wife was often offered for sale for a sum equivalent to about fourteen dollars. "Wall," was the comment of the Elder, "wall, if she's a good un, she's wuth it. She's wuth it."

Our ancestors wanted the worth of their sacrifice for learning, and followed their ideals in education with great persistence. The continuity essential to all deep and thorough culture is of special value to a college based on New England ideas. To the English mind, the commendable features of Yankee character are the inheritance of pure English blood. Yet the Puritan stock at home has achieved nothing noteworthy and distinctive, of recent years,—since the death of Cromwell. The Dutch, with more than their usual mental agility, after the lapse of two hundred and fifty years, are aroused to the discovery that the seeds of New England character were attached to the garments of the Pilgrims in passing through Holland. But we have as yet no far reaching influence, no rich, uplifting literature, no profound philosophy in spiritual things,—from the Pennsylvania Dutch, or those of Sleepy Hollow.

We have to conclude that the secret was in the combination of a serious, energetic people, working out the same vital ideas, amid congenial surroundings. If so, it is worth while not to lose this combination. The fathers wanted to get on in the world : to be something.

To be something they must know something, and to fit their young men for the highest service of American citizenship, they invented the American college.

It was the work of Mr. Webster to guard this invention from infringement. In framing their institutions the early Americans showed a marvellous foresight into the needs of the people who were to develop the country. Daniel Webster was heir to their intuitions. Those who study the Dartmouth College controversy must see that with all its complications, he was guided by an instinctive purpose to save what he believed to be a sacred inheritance.

A college of to-day which looked to the eighteenth century for its scholarship would also be looking to the eighteenth century for its scholars. But it is possible, while expanding in size and scope, to keep the practical spirit of the early College, with its individuality, local sentiment, and characteristic mental discipline.

The great universities have grown away from the college traditions, and seem to be leaving this field to the country institutions. They can hardly keep pace with the demand for elective, professional, and specialized training. Such demands are best met near the rich resources of the cities; their libraries, art treasures, courts, hospitals, asylums and vaudeville entertainments. But the universities lack the unity of growth and unity of structure to maintain the democratic simplicity of the historic college.

There is a point beyond which their facilities fail to facilitate. The young man, intent upon practical, economical training, not as an accomplishment, but for the accomplishment of the best work in life, should

lift up his eyes unto the hills from whence cometh his help.

It is a trite saying that our great men came from the hill towns. The rule of Uncle Eben Holden that he "never swore 'less 't was necessary" applies to the almost equally offensive habit of bragging. It should only be indulged in when occasion demands it. But an anniversary is such an occasion, and candor compels us to admit that of our leading statesmen and educators, men of influence and character, merchant princes and captains of industry, probably ninety per cent come directly or indirectly from rural New England. If a few of the ninety per cent should be traced to other origin, we might use the argument of the Perthshire man who claimed that Shakespeare was a Scotchman. When asked the reason for his persistence, he said, "Wull, mon, his abeelity cairtainly warrants the sup-posection."

The decay of rural New England threatened the supply of this sort of men. But the making of character and manhood has finally adapted itself to the new order of things. Like other processes, which at first were industries of the farm and household, it is now chiefly centered in large manufacturing establishments. One of these—which we are visiting—is just now concerned in finding storage room for the increasing raw material which comes in the form of freshmen. There is also a new sort of appreciative country life growing up to sustain the centers of education.

"Whatever skies above us rise, the hills, the hills are home."

That is what they are for. Old Home Week is growing into an Old Home Year and the Old Home life.

The hills are also a school. As remarked by a recent writer, the specializing of every kind of work has gone so far that the real provincial narrowness is found in the cities. Before one enters the narrow, confined avenue of his life work in Boston or in New York, he should lay the foundation of broad, cosmopolitan culture at Hanover, Amherst or Williams-town. The degree of Master of Arts seems to lack its full meaning in the hands of one who has studied the arts of man, but has learned nothing from nature, which is the art of God.

New England forces lose vitality without some reminder of New England hills. The Yankee flourishes only, as expressed by a fervid orator, where he is "surrounded on all sides by the nature of the country." In the rolling, diversified country of the Middle West, the Yankee stock maintains a noble civilization, but farther away, on treeless, sunbaked plains, it loses its social and economic bearings and follows the strangest of strange gods, with a devotion which varies with annual rainfall and prevalence of locusts. The place to revive the spirit of the fathers is where it reached its greatest intensity in the rugged scenes and tonic air of northern New England. Not that a college to attain the highest culture must perch on the summit of Mount Washington. The ideal location is among hills of about the size and contour of Balch's Hill, with mountains at the correct psychological distance, like Ascutney and Moosilauke.

In the neighboring cemetery is a stone commemorating one of the many interesting characters who have lived at Hanover, named Sally Duget. This woman succumbed more abruptly than most of us to the Hanover climate, and perished in a snow storm. Hanover children were encouraged to wander in the cemetery, in gloomy weather, for the improving associations, and committed to memory many of these inscriptions. In the Duget epitaph is one phrase which I have converted to my own use—"Under the guise of cheerfulness she hid deep woes."

Under the guise of assumed cheerfulness, I have been endeavoring to hide, probably with entire success, a serious proposition: that the twentieth century opens in striking similarity with the nineteenth in the need for educated and educating public spirit. The eighteenth century had been fertile in liberal ideas. The period a hundred years ago was filled with rejoicings over the newly-found rights of man. The nineteenth century has brought an equally wonderful progress in material expansion. We are now rejoicing in great commercial prosperity. But the old New England trait of prudence is not to be neglected.

For nice discrimination in the use of caution, no one could surpass the late Horace Frary. Many of you recall the Dartmouth Hotel—the unconventional attire of its proprietor; the grace in dispensing hospitality; the expressive soprano voice; the vest, rich with the spoils of time. In case of slight illness Mr. Frary made no objection to a physician. There came a time when he was attacked with a sudden and serious malady. Mrs. Frary saw Dr. Crosby coming down the street, and

started to call him in. Mr. Frary raised himself in bed and cried out in terrified appeal, "Do n't let him in. Do n't let the critter get in. 'This ain't no time to be foolin' with doctors; I tell ye, I'm sick.'"

This seems to betray a lack of confidence in one of the learned professions; but in its esoteric meaning it breathes the profoundest political philosophy. The time for a nation to take counsel of its physicians is when it is well. The old-time patriot was always ready to prescribe. The Commencement oratory of 1801 was full of heroic sentiment respecting the preservation of our liberties. As read to-day, the language of those young men, without money or influence, on the northern frontier of the new nation—their talk of saving the Union—seems like a huge joke. The point of the joke is that one of them did save the Union, as far as could be done in his day by one human being.

The passion for equal rights has now been succeeded by the passion for more equal wealth. Our ancestors were absorbed with questions of right, appealing to the heart and conscience. The present problems reach more deeply into the ultimate springs of human conduct. They touch the pocket.

They call not only for broad-minded, humane statesmanship, but for practical, educated common sense. Poisons brewed in the seething cities of Europe, must be counteracted by old-fashioned, country-bred patriotism made in America. It is not likely that supreme public service will again be rendered by a single massive and commanding intellect, but men of Dartmouth can be relied upon to keep the faith of the fathers, and, trained in sympathy with the people, to voice the

sober thought of the nation and hold up the high standard of American citizenship.

President Tucker : Among the men whom we inevitably recall as we think of Mr. Webster in his relation to the Dartmouth College Case, there is no stronger nor more prophetic figure than that of the then youthful president of the College, Francis Brown. We know what he wrought in his time, we know what he left as a heritage, not only in his work but in the stock which he planted here. I have the pleasure of presenting to the audience, Francis Brown of the third generation.

Speech of Professor Francis Brown, D.D., LL. D., '70.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :—

OUR days ago I had no hope of being here this evening. A ship struggling with heavy weather in mid-ocean held out no promise. I had gone so far as to frame the telegram which I should have the pain of sending from New York this afternoon explaining my absence. And even now that fortune has been kinder to me than I had a right to expect, there are two serious drawbacks to the full satisfaction of the evening for me. One is the deep regret at not having enjoyed with you the feast of good things that has preceded this banquet for the last two days. The orations and the choruses and the illuminations have not been for me. I have not even had the opportunity of attiring myself in the festal garments in which so many of my brother

alumni have been bravely disporting themselves. But the more serious drawback lies in the difficulty of the subject which has been presented to me. Since the career of Daniel Webster is not complete without the history of the Dartmouth College Case, and since in the Dartmouth College Case the active head of the College was closely concerned, it has seemed fitting to you, sir, that some reference should be made here to the connection of President Brown with that Case. And my problem is, within brief limits of time, and without doing substantial injustice to the theme, to discuss it in terms befitting the modesty of the man himself, and not unbecoming in one who bears his name. In this difficult situation it has seemed to me that the path of safety was the path of simplicity. Therefore, without attempting to analyze or weigh the precise service of President Brown, I shall try merely to indicate a few aspects of the Dartmouth College Case as they presented themselves to him.

In the first place, then, the struggle into which he entered was for him a moral issue. It was a moral issue in the sense of not being a mere legal battle, and in the sense also of not being a mere personal concern. In a legal battle, as such, he would have had deep and intelligent interest. In personal affairs as such he would have had that concern which becomes every man. But the Case of the College presented itself to him primarily under its moral aspect, as involving great and enduring principles of human life and action. His relation to it cannot be appreciated without remembering that the difficulty did not originate under his administration. He found it when he came upon the stage. It was not

of his choice, that, in one aspect of this difficulty, it seemed to bring him into conflict with the authorities of the Commonwealth. He was a native of this state and loved and honored it. He was born, as Webster himself was born, before the Constitution of the United States was adopted. He had that reverence for Statehood which belonged to the time of those beginnings, and which had not begun to be overshadowed as it has been for some minds in recent years,—not wholly to our good,—by the sole conception of the national life. He had no zeal, therefore, in any contest which opposed him to the authorities of the Commonwealth. But the College Case embodied for him that which he revered with the profoundest forces of his mind and heart. It meant for him the confidence of donors, it meant for him the solemnity of prayers, it meant the consecration of lives, it meant a history already worth commemorating and preserving as men had been trained and fitted for the work of life; the whole embodiment of the College in its sacredness and power entered into his conception of the Case, and it seemed to him that, standing as he did and representing what he did, a moral imperative was upon him which he dared not refuse to follow, and that in fighting for the College he was obeying God.

In the next place the struggle appealed to him as a demand upon intellect. He felt that the utmost powers of his mind were claimed by the College in that critical time, in reference to the question of its right to be. The head of a college, placed as Dartmouth College was in those years, he felt must know his ground, must command the situation. Whether or not he appeared be-

fore the public eye as a leader in the work, he must be within himself conscious in some degree of the mastery of leadership. The situation, in its many phases, was, of course, discussed privately, a hundred times over, in advance of its public argument before the courts, and I understand that he was not without gifts enabling him to enter into the details of the Case, master them in their somewhat complicated history and relations, and hold them firmly and steadily, keeping their balance and their proportion, and so, from time to time, from month to month, from year to weary year, rendering real service to those who were called to plead, in all the various steps and stages through which the struggle passed till its final and crowning triumph.

In the third place, the struggle presented itself to his mind as hopeful because of its great alliances. These alliances involved mutual trust, a common responsibility, the sharing in one great work. The abundance of the allies he found, the trustworthiness and comfort of them, he appreciated and never belittled. The alliance of the students of his time was something which he prized beyond words. I believe that he had personal attractiveness and winning power, and that students were drawn towards him ; that seeing in him, in some sense, an embodiment of the institution, under whose care they were studying and which they were learning to love, they loved it in him. The names of some of those who were undergraduates in his time will suggest the larger company of men, who, as students, held loyally to the work of the College through all that trying time. Such names as those of George P. Marsh, Judge Nathan Crosby, Judge Nesmith, Rufus Choate, all

graduated during his brief term of service as president, remind us of the choice spirits among the undergraduates of those years, and of the worthy alliance on which he depended when he trusted them. Then there was the faculty, working under difficulties that we can hardly appreciate, and doing faithfully the work that was set them to do. There were the trustees, holding steadfastly on their way, hoping for the light that was to come. There were of course, also, those figures that come back most familiarly to us all as we review the Case, those lawyers of New Hampshire who stood for the College here, those who represented it before the Supreme Court of the nation, and, chief of all, the great advocate to whom the success of the College, by common agreement, was most largely due. It was in alliance with these men and by such alliance alone that he felt success for the right could be gained.

Just one aspect more I shall venture to mention. He regarded his concern in the struggle of the College as an addition to the common daily work of the presidency, and not as a substitute for it. It seems to me that the ethical power involved in a statement of that kind is no unworthy matter for us to think of to-night. It was not his to devote himself exclusively to representing the College before the legal tribunals of the state and nation, or even before that wider tribunal in which verdicts are given by the agreement of right-minded men. He felt much of the burden of a champion, but this obligation was in a certain sense a mere adjunct to his chief activity. The college life had to go on, the young men who were here had to be taught, all the details of college work had to be managed, and the double

strain, it is easy to believe, was that which brought his life to so early an end. And he himself did not grudge it. He gave all he had. He gave himself absolutely. He spent his powers without reserve. The vital force was exhausted at the end of the struggle and he died the year after the decision was given. He had not been called to lead the forces on the battle-field. He was the commander of the garrison, holding on, while the brilliant tactician and general was waging the fight out in the open. The captain of the garrison, whose first duty is within the walls, but whose heart and brain are in the hot battle outside, may have an ethical force in him quite equal to that of the active leader who wins the battle. He may not claim the credit of the victory, but he may have greatly helped to make the victory worth the while.

For such reasons as these, it is, perhaps, appropriate that President Brown should be remembered in the Webster Celebration. I have in my possession the autograph letter which Mr. Webster wrote to him just after the decision was rendered in Washington. If it had been accessible to me this morning I should have brought it with me. Not that it is unknown; it has been published. But there is some interest in the paper itself with Mr. Webster's handwriting and signature upon it. It bears perpetual witness to the close relation between Daniel Webster, the great jurist, and the president of the College, doing his quiet work here, and standing bravely for what he believed the right.

I must not say more of him now. He sleeps not far from this spot. His son has been laid to rest beside

him. And there some day his son's son hopes also to lie. I have no quarrel with those who in thinking of the rewards of the future dwell upon crowns and golden harps,—having some understanding of what these things symbolize,—but I should be sorry for the man who was looking forward to the crown without service rendered, or to whom the opportunity for larger service was not the brightest diadem. For noble minds, the greatest reward must lie in the service, and not in the wages of service; work done of which the result lives on after the workman has stopped working, is itself the truest reward. And, in that sense again, it seems not unfitting to join in this place the names of Daniel Webster and President Brown. By faithful service men live and by the fruits of it institutions grow great and endure. If Dartmouth is growing great and shall endure, the ground of it must be sought in the service, great or small, of many faithful ones working together with consecrated purpose, who find a stimulus in the undying hope of making their lives worth while for their College, and for their country, and for the world.

President Tucker: When we wish to bring the past and the present of the College together, there is one man amongst us in whom they meet on equal terms, Judge Cross, of the class of 1841.

Speech of the Honorable David Cross, LL. D., '41.

Mr. President and Brothers—and you, so near and yet so far [apostrophizing the ladies in the distant gallery]:—

feel oppressed, Mr. President, as I rise to speak on this occasion, as never before. Voices speak to me that do not to any of you. Sixty-four years ago I came to Hanover a student. The boys that were with me then, where are they? Echo answers, “Where?” A few survive. Most are gone. Voices speak to me in happy memory. Voices speak to me in solemn, sad recollection, and it seems as if I must pour out my soul here to-night and talk of things that I have felt and have seen and have known, connected with dear old Dartmouth College. But, brethren, last week I received a summons from our President, whom we all delight to honor and obey, saying, “Come to the Webster Banquet and talk six or eight minutes on Daniel Webster’s training at the New Hampshire bar.” I yield to the proprieties of the occasion, I subdue the joyous thoughts of college life and present simply a lawyer’s brief.

In 1818, at thirty-six years of age, Mr. Webster made his argument in the Dartmouth College Case before the Supreme Court of the United States. It was addressed, as Rufus Choate has said, “To a tribunal presided over by Marshall, assisted by Washington, Livingston, Johnson, Story, Todd, and Duvall—a tribunal unsurpassed on earth of all that gives illustration to a bench of law and sustained and venerated

by a noble bar." His opponents were William Wirt, Holmes, and other most illustrious lawyers of the time. The legal argument occupied five hours and the peroration, as described by Professor Goodrich, was the most brilliant ever heard in that court. The judges and the listeners were moved to tears as Mr. Webster appealed, with eloquent words and trembling lips, for the life of the College. His argument prevailed and a construction of the Constitution of the United States was then given of far-reaching importance, not only for this College, but for every eleemosynary institution in the United States. The reputation of Mr. Webster before, as a lawyer, was local, but it immediately became national, and from that time he was the acknowledged great lawyer.

On this one hundredth anniversary of his graduation, his characteristics as student, scholar, lawyer, diplomat and statesman have been presented in fitting eloquent tribute, but the one distinguishing act of his life, the one which comes nearest to our hearts, the one which links his name indissolubly with us and our College is that argument in 1818 which won for him the title of "Refounder of Dartmouth College."

Up to the time of this argument nearly all his education and training had been in New Hampshire. Before reviewing his training at the New Hampshire bar I think it desirable to speak briefly of him as a college boy and law student. His college education and preparation for the law was not the result of any special planning by himself or his parents. He went to college because his father, like other New England fathers, wished to give his children the benefit of an

education which he had no opportunity of acquiring for himself, and because his son exhibited a passion for reading and study. He read every book within his reach and committed to memory almost everything he read so that there was no period in his after life when he was not able to repeat verbatim what he had learned in his boyhood. He read *Don Quixote* at one sitting, or during one night; he committed to memory much of the Bible, Watts' Hymns, whole books of poetry and many of the great speeches of distinguished men.

The story as given in Mr. Webster's autobiography of that ride from his home to the Rev. Mr. Woods' school, when his father first spoke of his intention to give him a college education, is a pathetic revelation of a son's tender reverence and appreciation of a father's self-sacrificing love. It reveals also the desire and ambition of the son for an education.

From all that I can learn from his autobiography, his letters published by his son Fletcher, from tradition and biography, I do not believe that Mr. Webster, before he commenced the practice of law, had any idea of his superior ability or the high position he would attain. He was induced to study law by his father's wish, rather than from any well considered thought or plan of his own.

There has been a sort of tradition that at one time he contemplated studying for the ministry, but I cannot find any facts to confirm such report. It does seem to me, however, that if he had been urged to the study of theology by his father, as he was urged to the study of law, he would have become a great theologian instead of a great lawyer.

His letters to his brother Ezekiel, his classmates, Bingham, Merrill and others, written while in college and later, are delightful reading and give us a view of Webster such as no one can know who has looked upon him only as the great expounder of the Constitution of the United States.

I am tempted to quote extensively from his correspondence because these letters bring him before us as a student, as a friend and brother; intensely human, full of joy, poetry, and the humor of life, with a mind of sincere honesty of purpose and devotion to truth, duty, and religion, and a heart of boundless wealth of affection for family and friends.

Thirty young men graduated in the class of 1801, eleven became lawyers, of whom not one attained distinction in his profession except Webster.

He was in Mr. Thompson's office nearly three years and in Christopher Gore's office in Boston a few months; was admitted to the bar in Suffolk County, Massachusetts, in June, 1805; returned to Boscawen and remained about two years, and removed to Portsmouth, in 1807. In a letter to his classmate Bingham, dated at Fryeburg, May, 1802, he wrote, "Now, I will enumerate the inducements that draw me towards law. First, and principally, it is my father's wish. He does not dictate, it is true, but how much short of dictation is the mere wish of a parent, whose labors of life are wasted on favors to his children. Even the delicacy with which this wish is expressed, gives it more effect than it would have in the form of a command. Secondly, my friends generally wish it. They are urgent and pressing. My father even offers me—I will sometime tell

you what—and Mr. Thompson offers my tuition gratis, and to relinquish his stand to me.”

May 3, 1802, in a letter to Fuller he says, “The law is certainly, as it seems to me, rather hard study and to mollify it with some literary amusements I should think profitable.”

In a letter to his classmate, Merrill, January, 1803, he wrote, “This law reading, Thomas, has no tendency to add the embellishments of literature to a student’s acquisitions. Our books are written in a hard, didactic style, interspersed on every page with the mangled pieces of murdered Latin.”

In a letter to Mr. Cook, June, 1803, he wrote, “I am not informed what profession you are determined to study, but if it be law, permit me to tell you a little what you must expect. My experience in the study is indeed short, but I have learnt a little about it. First then, you must bid adieu to all hopes of meeting with a single author who pretends to elegance of style or sweetness of observation.”

In November, 1803, he wrote to Merrill, “Accuracy and diligence are much more necessary to a lawyer, than great comprehension of mind, or brilliancy of talent. His business is to refine, define, and split hairs, to look into authorities, and compare cases. A man can never gallop over the fields of law on Pegasus, nor fly across them on the wing of oratory. If he would stand on *terra firma* he must descend; if he would be a great lawyer, he must first consent to be only a great drudge.”

In his Autobiography Mr. Webster said, “I read Coke on Littleton through without understanding a

quarter part of it. Why disgust and discourage a boy by telling him that he must break into his profession through such a wall as reading Coke? I really often despaired. I thought I never could make myself a lawyer and was almost going back to the business of school teaching."

In 1805 in a letter to Merrill, from Boston, he wrote, "Gifford's Life and Posthumous Works, Moore's Travels in France and Italy, *et pauca alia similia*, have rescued me from the condemnation of doing nothing. At present, I am in earnest in the study of the French language, and can now translate about as much, for a task, as we could of Tully in our Freshman year."

In May, 1805, in a letter to Bingham, written at Boscawen: "You must know that I have opened a shop in this village for the manufacture of justice writs. Other mechanics do pretty well here, and I am determined to try my luck among others." And in one dated January, 1806, "My business has been just about so, so; its quantity less objectionable than its quality."

At the September term, 1805, he entered in the Superior Court of Hillsborough county, at Hopkinton, twenty-two writs and argued two causes before the jury in the presence of his father, one of the judges upon the bench. These causes were Haddock v. Woodward and Corson v. Corson, both of small importance. He won the former and lost the latter. Parker Noyes, one of the most skilful practitioners in the state was his opposing counsel. The original writs are on file in the office of the Superior Court at Nashua.

The next spring he was assigned by the court to defend a criminal for murder in the Grafton County

Court. The murder was of such an atrocious nature and so unprovoked that Webster could find only one ground for defence—that of insanity. The argument of Webster for the defence attracted wide attention at the time and gained him a reputation in all that region of New Hampshire as the most adroit and skilful lawyer of the state.

Mr. Webster's real life as a lawyer commenced in 1807 in Portsmouth. The men practising in Rockingham County during the nine years he lived and practised there constituted a body of lawyers hardly equalled by the same number at any time in this country. To give their names is sufficient for any lawyer to recall something of the wonderful ability and achievements of these men at the bar in New Hampshire, in Massachusetts, and in Waslington. Among them were Joseph Story, Samuel Dexter, Theophilus Parsons, of Massachusetts, Jeremiah Smith, William Plummer, George Sullivan, Ichabod Bartlett and Jeremiah Mason of New Hampshire. George Sullivan had then been eleven years at the bar, William Plummer thirteen, and Jeremiah Smith twenty-three years, while Ichabod Bartlett was four years later.

The biographer of William Plummer, in speaking of the Rockingham Bar at this time, says, "The bar was well denominated at this period of its greatest strength 'the arena of giants.' It indeed witnessed the strife of Titans. Weak men did not mingle in it; strong men felt their need of strength." Judge Story characterized it as one of "vast law learning and prodigious intellectual power."

Jeremiah Smith was profoundly learned in the common law and a most accomplished scholar, superior in exact scholarship to either Mason or Webster.

Mason and Smith had remarkable, and, perhaps, equal industry in the preparation of causes; Smith fortifying his position with accurate authority while Mason trusted more to his native strength and force of reason.

The biographer of Theophilus Parsons says that "The reform which Judge Smith began was effectually carried out and the pleading in New Hampshire was probably as accurate and skilful as in any state of the Union." Joel Parker said of Smith that "under him the practice of law was reduced to practical science."

George Sullivan and Ichabod Bartlett were both eminent in their profession and would rank at any time among the best lawyers in the state. They, however, were inferior in many points to Mason, and Smith and Webster.

Jeremiah Smith by his learning, his industry and great ability, helped Webster. He was aided undoubtedly by the other eminent men named, but he was trained more by Jeremiah Mason than by all others. I believe that his association with Jeremiah Mason during his nine years of law practice in New Hampshire, helped train Webster's mind not alone for law and for the exhibition of profound learning as a lawyer, but as well for statesmanship and for conciseness and clearness, such as he afterwards exhibited in his Bunker Hill speeches, the Girard Will Case, the reply to Hayne of South Carolina, in the trial of Knapp at Salem, the Dartmouth College and other celebrated cases.

Mr. Webster once said, "When I went to Portsmouth I was a young man of twenty-four and Mr. Mason forty. He was then at the head of the bar, and was employed in nearly all the great cases. He was a terror to young lawyers, but we traveled together and roomed together and he was one of my earliest, truest, and best friends."

Mr. Choate once asked Webster's opinion of Mason, and among other things he said, "I regard Jeremiah Mason as eminently superior to any other lawyer whom I have ever met. I would rather, with my own experience (and I have had some pretty tough experiences with him), meet them all combined in a case than to meet him alone and single handed. He was the keenest lawyer I have ever met or read about. If a man had Jeremiah Mason and he did not get his case, no human ingenuity or learning could get it."

Mr. Webster, late in life said, "If you were to ask me who was the greatest lawyer in the country I should answer, John Marshall, but if you took me by the throat and pinned me to the wall and demanded my real opinion I should be compelled to say it was Jeremiah Mason." At another time he said, "Mason's method of argument led me to study my own style and set about reforming it."

In November, 1849, Mr. Webster introduced resolutions before the United States Court in honor of Jeremiah Mason, then lately deceased, and a part of one of these resolutions was in these words, "In the fact that the state of New Hampshire now possesses such a system of law whose gladsome light has shone in other states, are seen both the product and the moun-

ment of his labors, less conspicuous, if not less real than as if embodied in codes and institutions bearing his name."

In his remarks upon that occasion, he said, "I am bound to say that of my own professional discipline and attainments, whatever they may be, I owe much to that close attention to the discharge of my duties which I was compelled to pay for nine successive years, from day to day by Mr. Mason's efforts and arguments at the bar. '*Fas est ab hoste doceri*;' and I must have been unintelligent, indeed, not to have learned something from the constant display of that power which I had so much occasion to see and feel."

It is well authenticated by biographers of Mr. Webster that his style before he had known Mason had been somewhat florid; afterwards it was terse, simple and graphic.

Mr. Lodge says, "Fortune showered many favors upon Mr. Webster, but none more valuable than that of having Jeremiah Mason as his chief opponent at the New Hampshire bar. He gave Mr. Webster his friendship, staunch and unfailing, until his death. He gave freely also of his wisdom and experience in advice and counsel. The strong qualities of Mr. Webster's mind fully developed by constant practice and under such influences. In a word, the unequalled power of stating facts or principles which was a predominant quality of Mr. Webster's genius grew steadily with a vigorous vitality, while his eloquence developed in a similar striking fashion. But the best lesson Mr. Webster learned from his wary, yet daring antagonist, was in regard to style."

In 1806 Mr. Webster was a country lawyer, twenty-four years of age, bringing suits for the collection of small debts and other trifling causes of action, trying them before uneducated justices of the peace who, according to custom, decided for the lawyer employing them, and occasionally also contending in the higher courts with sharp practitioners, like Parker Noyes. His annual income at this time did not exceed six hundred dollars. To remain there would tend to make him like his contestants, or more likely, drive him from the profession.

More than most men Mr. Webster needed the spur and excitement of a great cause and a strong opponent to bring out his best mental resources. At Portsmouth, in 1807, he immediately felt the necessity for his utmost effort. Then he began to see the "gladsome light of jurisprudence" and to understand the fundamental principles of common law and equity.

Then he first really discovered himself; then he put on the giant armor of his knighthood and with exulting heart met men of his own mental strength and of his own high ideals and aspirations.

It was his seven years at Portsmouth that developed and trained him to become the "first of American lawyers and the first of American statesmen."

From all that I can learn of Mr. Webster and his contemporaries; from history and biography and his own writings, I arrive at the conclusion that it was during his nine years' practice of law in New Hampshire that he was trained and trained himself in his knowledge of the common law, in the preparation of causes for the jury and the court; in the cross-exami-

nation of witnesses; in his method and manner of argument; in simplicity, directness and strength of written and oral speech.

President Tucker: There are few occasions of this nature, or of any public intent or concern, complete without the word of Dr. William Everett. But our special claim upon him lies in the fact of his knowledge of Mr. Webster as Secretary of State through his father, the successor of Mr. Webster in the State Department.

Speech of the Honorable William Everett, Ph. D., LL. D.

Mr. President :—

feel that I might almost say I began life under the aegis of Mr. Webster as Secretary of State.

I had the misfortune, sir, to be born under Van Buren. I admit it. But before I acquired consciousness, VanBuren was out of power, and the very first glimmering of consciousness, so far back that when I say I recollect certain things, old friends tell me I do not recollect them, but that they were told me, was under his successor. Mr. Edward Webster was a member of our household, then domiciled in Florence, and I was held in his arms. I had his name breathed in my ears as early as that of any of my family. It was his father's commission that brought us from Florence to London, and my first undoubted, continuous recollections begin in London, when his name was spoken exactly as often in our household as any of our own kindred. I feel, sir, that I have a right to speak of the services of that

man whom, indeed, I never heard in public, but whom I knew in a better way than in public.

“Seen him I have, but in his happier hour
Of social pleasure, ill exchanged for power.”

I saw him in our house. There was no stateliness there, there was no pompousness, there was no drawing back, as if he was too great for common persons to look up to, which is the way you would think he was by some of the portraits and descriptions. No, when he came into our house, and my mother, who was afraid of nothing under heaven, held out her hands to him, she took him right off his high horse, and he was the easiest and most affectionate and gentlest of mortals. There is, sir, a touching story in the Arabian legends of how, long after the great reformer had disappeared, the son of his follower was murdered by a tyrant, and as the head of Hassan was brought to him, he struck his staff on the lip, and an old man said, “I have seen those lips pressed to the lips of the prophet of God.” No tyrant will ever think it worth while to strike at my head,—but these lips have been pressed to the lips of him who was, indeed, to Americans a prophet of God.

In the few minutes which it is proper for me to take, sir, I am glad of the opportunity to say a few words of Webster's services as Secretary of State. The country may, perhaps, think of him chiefly in connection with the work of the Senate House, but the permanent work he wrought for our relations with foreign nations is a thing which Americans ought not to forget. Mr. Webster took a stand in the State department which is the one which every American should take, that of perfect dignity, of perfect calmness, of reasoning out

the quarrels of America in such a way that foreign powers shall be forced to recognize the truth of our position and there will never be any danger of war or even of quarrelling, for such arguments as his will always silence, as his silenced any opposing word among the other nations, if there were any. You know, for instance, that there had been a constant quarrel between England and America on the subject of the right of search, which had led to a war, and when peace was made at the end of the war which was made for the right of search, nothing was ever said about the right of search in the treaty, and the quarrel remained in spite of the war. Mr. Webster as Secretary of State addressed a letter to Lord Aberdeen on the right of search, and that letter never was answered by the English Government, but the right of search was never talked about again from the time that letter was written.

Webster also as Secretary of State negotiated the first Extradition Treaty—the first treaty which enabled us to feel that those criminals who escaped to foreign nations were still as much in our power as if they had remained within our borders and that other nations might feel the same of us. Just consider, brethren, — Dartmouth men are brethren of Harvard men, ain't they?—just consider, brethren; suppose in this last terrible assassination which has stricken the heart of the country to its depths, perpetrated on the very borders of Canada, the criminal had managed to escape to Canada across the Niagara River, should we have been troubled? No, because he would have been surrendered by the Government of Canada as completely as if he had escaped to Philadelphia or Detroit. But

before Mr. Webster's time he would not have been surrendered. Now, escape would have been as useless to him across the border as it would have been to the edge of the country, and that great blessing we owe to his negotiations as Secretary of State.

But he did something greater and better for us. When Mr. Webster came in as General Harrison's Secretary, England and America were on the verge of war. There was a quarrel about the northeastern boundary and about the northwestern boundary. There was a quarrel on the border of Niagara about the sympathizers and the arrest of McLeod. The English Foreign office had been in the hands of Lord Palmerston. That man was determined to pick a quarrel with every land which did not submit to his dictation. Happily that government had gone out of power about the time Gen. Harrison's government came into power in this country, and Mr. Webster was determined that the causes of quarrels which had existed off and on for half a century should be put an end to. A special envoy was sent from England, and Mr. Webster met Lord Ashburton with open hands, and not with clenched fists. The northeastern boundary apparently could not be settled; it seemed as if there must be a war if each nation held what each considered its rights. Such a war would have been popular in the United States. There was dissatisfaction with Great Britain. Two wars had not let out enough bad blood and there must be a third. Supposing Mr. Webster had said to Lord Ashburton, "We will maintain our rights; we will maintain that the Highlands, which divide the rivers flowing into the St. Lawrence from the rivers flowing into the Atlantic, are

where we say and not where you say." If he had also said, "We will claim Oregon to 54°40', and if you do not like it we will fight for it," how popular that would have been! How all the yeomanry in the North and all the chivalry of the South would have rushed across the St. Lawrence and the St. Croix and the Columbia! Think of the Princeton, which was receiving her arms that proved fatal to Mr. Webster's successor, how she would have been sent out to prey upon the English commerce. Think how he might have floated into the presidency as the great war secretary at the end of Tyler's term. Think how popular he would have become with the Whig party that had almost renounced him for staying in the cabinet. He knew better. He was willing to give up what the state of Maine thought were her rights, he was willing to give up everything that might have given him a crown of glory equal to any great war statesman, for the more enduring, the more perfect crown, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." He knew that any war, all wars, are sins and crimes and blunders, but he knew that the war between England and the United States for a few square miles near the St. Johns River was a crime, a sin, a blunder beyond comparison, and he was willing to sacrifice what a meaner, a less far-sighted, a more passionate statesman would have held as his glory, in order to make and keep the peace between those who never should be at war.

He settled the boundary, and England became friends with us. They said in England that her rights were given up; we said in America that our rights were given up. What right is more precious than that of living in peace

with those with whom war is a sin? In consequence of that action of his, settling the northeastern boundary, there followed in the next administration the settlement of the northwestern boundary. That was not entrusted to him, but although it was done by the next administration it was just as much his work as the northeastern boundary, because if he had not settled the northeastern boundary as he did the next administration would never have gone on and perfected his work.

Upon what he did in his second administration as Secretary of State I will not dwell here. All I can say here is that those who declare that after his Seventh of March Speech he lost all credit with the nation, entirely forget that second administration; they forget that magnificent state paper, the Hülsemann Letter. If anyone fancies that Americans had given up their statesman of 1850, he may see what Mr. Webster did in 1851 and 1852, holding the pen in his hand and signing the papers that were to state the opinion of America in dignified terms down to the very moment of his death. When he was lying in that darkened chamber at Marshfield he was thinking of the public business and arranging for its proper transaction to the very last. And while Secretary of State the second time he combined the orator with the statesman. Although he was not in a position where oratory is generally looked for, he made his magnificent Fourth of July Speech at the laying of the corner-stone of the capitol in 1851, when he uttered one of the most remarkable prophecies ever recorded in political history and raised himself entirely above the level of statesmen who live for the present. The audience was chiefly composed of Virginians. On the fourth of

July in the city of Washington you would not expect to have any but a Virginia and Maryland audience such as gathered on that occasion to listen to him. He took up his favorite theme, the sin of abandoning the Union. He talked to the representatives of Virginia, those on the James River, and those beyond the Blue Ridge, and then he spoke to those who live beyond the Allegheny and warned them of the evils of breaking up the Union. He said—I have to quote from memory—I have not studied it in the book—I may say as Lord Mansfield did on a similar occasion, “I have consulted no books, indeed I have no books to consult,”—but Mr. Webster said, “Do you think, ye men of Western Virginia, that you can remain part and parcel of Virginia a month after Virginia has ceased to be part and parcel of the United States?” Who else in 1851 thought that in 1861 the northwestern counties of Virginia would be cut off and become a separate state in consequence of the secession of old Virginia? It was his vision, but it was his revealed vision, his inspired vision, that told him that if the South tried to break from the North the line of cleavage would run through the Old Dominion itself, and that the North would gain those that the South had held for her own and never could get back after the original and terrible mistake. Here we have him a peacemaker with foreign nations, a prophet to his own, never forgetting to maintain the honor of his country in irresistible argument, never forgetting to hold out the hand of peace to our cousins across the water, to our brothers among ourselves; and, surely what greater service than that of the peacemaker and the prophet could any states-

man render to the country of his choice?

It is time for me to close, sir, but I wish with your permission to close with offering a sentiment which though not directly appropriate to Mr. Webster is surely never inappropriate in speaking of him and speaking of Dartmouth College. Immediately after Mr. Webster had gone to his grave, Dartmouth College held, in the year 1853, a solemn commemoration of his connection with her, and on that occasion a eulogy was delivered by that son of Dartmouth College who rivalled Mr. Webster as forensic orator and might have rivalled him as senatorial orator if he had not just touched the cup of senatorial greatness and then let it pass from his lips. On that occasion there was a vindication of Mr. Webster's position in 1850 which is utterly unanswerable. I offer you as a sentiment, sir, at your Webster commemoration:—

“The memory of Rufus Choate, the friend, the follower, the eulogist of Daniel Webster; Dartmouth owes him an incalculable debt and among its items will dwell with peculiar gratitude on that discourse which demonstrated that, as Webster's political sagacity was beyond the criticism of emulous rivals, so his political morality was beyond the cavil of narrow minded censors.”

President Tucker: In a letter recently received reviving some reminiscences of his boyhood I note this passage: “The first time I ever fired a gun was at Sandwich in September, 1826. The gentlemen of the party had returned from shooting with their fowling pieces loaded and called upon us boys to fire them. I

think on that occasion I fired Mr. Webster's." The writer of this letter might have added that he has never since fired guns of any less calibre. I have the pleasure to introduce to you the Reverend Doctor Edward Everett Hale.

Speech of the Reverend Edward Everett Hale, D.D., LL. D.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :—

AM heartily indebted to my hosts for their invitation to be present on this occasion. The occasion has proved itself not simply one of pride and congratulation among the friends of Mr. Webster and the College, but one of historical importance as well.

For myself, my right to speak rests wholly upon the memories which a child, who became a big boy, who became a young man, and who was thirty years old when Mr. Webster died, has of the kindness which a great man can show to a very young friend. From the moment when Mr. Webster removed to Boston in 1817, he and my father were intimate friends. I have a fancy, indeed, that they had first met in the charming society of Exeter. Exeter is a place of which I always speak with tenderness and regard, because if my father had not been the mathematical preceptor at Exeter, he would never have met my mother and in that case I do not know where I should be to-day. Mr. Webster had established his brother, Ezekiel, in a school in Boston while he was himself studying law in Christopher Gore's office. I think

that my father and Mr. Edward Everett relieved Mr. Ezekiel Webster in that school at different times when he was not well. I may say in passing that that was the sort of men who were schoolmasters before the inventions of modern machinery.

Of course their children were intimate friends. Edward Webster, the second son of him whom we celebrate, only six months older than I, was my school-mate till we were twelve years old. We struck with the same bat at the same ball: we drove our hoops side by side: we made the same mistakes over the same fable of Phaedrus. If we were in the house, it was his father's house or my father's house. Almost the earliest thing I remember was a September visit to the Cape in 1826, when Mr. Webster and Judge Story and Judge Fay and my father went down to the Cape for some shooting. The ladies and children of the families went with them, and great was my pride when at the modest age of four years I was permitted to discharge one of the guns at an unoffending shingle. Mr. Webster was very fond of children and got along excellently well with them. I am always proud to tell this story of a child's game of speculation or commerce at which at some birthday party we were all playing in his own library. The great library table was cleared for us, and, as it happened, I sat by Mr. Webster's side. In the exigencies of the game, perhaps from my own imprudent playing, I had lost all my ivory counters, and I cried out, "I have nothing left. Have I no friend who will lend to me?" With perfectly characteristic generosity, Mr. Webster pushed half his stock in front of me and said, "Edward, as long as I live you shall never

say you have not a friend." I was a child, but I treasured the words and they always proved true.

Senator Lodge may well express his surprise that any one who knew Mr. Webster at all thought he had no sense of humor. His humor cropped out always when he was at ease. In those days of his younger practice, he was sitting in the Dedham Court House when a murder trial was going on. He may have been one of the counsel, I do not know. He condensed the testimony in these lines, which are gruesome enough, but show his ready and easy tact in versification :

“ There was blood on the door,
There was blood on the floor,
There was blood on the kitchen stair,
And all in the cracks
Of the murderer's axe
There was clotted blood and hair.”

I cannot dissect his contribution, but I have a child's poem which he and some of the other lawyers wrote with my father and mother for me, to entertain me in sickness. It was the trial of the sparrow for the murder of cock robin. I have always guessed that Mr. Webster furnished these lines, because they are the best in the little poem and because they are such good law :

“The judge charged the jury
For an hour and a quarter :
He spoke first of murder
And then of manslaughter.
“He stated that malice
Was the essence of crime,
And that this was too clear
To take up their time :
“That if the defendant,
When his arrow he hurled,

Had acted from malice
Against the whole world,
"And cared not who suffered,
So he had his sport,
That then he deserved
The worst sentence of Court."

It has not seemed to me that enough has been said of the wide range of observation, of reading, of conversation, and, therefore, of information which went with the tireless activity of an unequalled mind. He would talk of Greek history, he would discuss the letters of Linnaeus as easily as he might tell an anecdote of John Adams, or laugh at an absurdity of Lord Eldon. He worked very easily, so easily that I have heard men speak of his leisure as if it were affected leisure. This does not seem to me fair. He seemed to be ready to discuss the accuracy of Pope's translation of Homer, and he was ready. He was ready, because that morning at half-past five he had lighted the kindlings in his own grate, had been at his desk at six, and when the family met at breakfast he had already finished the important part of the work of the day.

I would gladly speak of the devout and distinctly spiritual element in Mr. Webster's power. I would like to say a word in condemnation of the preposterous imputation that he was intemperate in his appetites. But on these matters I am sure that full justice will be done him by history.

President Tucker : If we pass from personal reminiscences of Mr. Webster to his political inheritance, to whom shall we turn with one accord except to the senior Senator from Massachusetts—Senator Hoar.

Speech of the Honorable George Frisbie Hoar, LL. D.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :—

OW many men have there been in this country whose college would celebrate their taking their degree one hundred years afterward, or fifty years after they died? It might have been done for Washington and Lincoln. But they were not college men. It might have been done for Hamilton or Jefferson. But neither Hamilton or Jefferson got through college, and Jefferson was not in general a favorite with college men. I believe Bowdoin will do it for Longfellow, and I believe Harvard will do it for Emerson. I cannot think of any other. Yet no man will doubt the absolute fitness of the ceremonial of to-day.

Daniel Webster died under a cloud of obloquy. He had deeply offended the North, and he had not won the South. He had offended his own state, which had so honored and loved him. The ordinary political antagonisms, always bitter, bitter now, were bitter in his time to a degree we can hardly comprehend now. He had pained and grieved the conscience of his country. He was held for a time to be untrue to liberty. I suppose the contemporary judgment when he died was that of Theodore Parker, rather than that of Choate or of Everett.

But now few men can be found anywhere who think otherwise than kindly and lovingly of this illustrious son of Dartmouth. We have had fifty years to think of it. If the republic abide, his name and fame will abide with it. If the republic die, his name and fame shall

be inseparably intertwined with its memory, as the fame of Pericles is intertwined with that of Athens.

The wisest and best men are likely to differ most sharply in applying what seem the simplest and clearest principles of morals and duty and political liberty to the conduct of states, as they differ most sharply as to the creeds of religious sects, and the man who is most positive is most likely to be wrong. The moral is not that good men should abate in their zeal for righteousness or liberty, but only that they should abate in the bitterness of their judgments of others with whom they differ.

We have learned, nearly all of us, that the things about which honest and brave and patriotic men are most likely to differ and to impute bad motives and inconsistencies to each other, are those which seem to them the plainest principles and the clearest maxims of public liberty, or the most express and unmistakable mandates of religion.

Each man has given to him his own light. He is a laggard or a dastard if he do not follow it. But he is nowhere commanded to sit in judgment on the motives of other men. On the contrary, the divine command is, "Judge not," and the punishment for disobedience to that command is that you are to be treated as you treat other men, and that the measure you mete shall be measured to you again.

In doing justice to him, let us do justice to the men who condemned him. Those of us who thought as I thought, and as I now think, the counsel he gave his countrymen in regard to the Compromise Measures, in conflict with the great mandate of justice and of consti-

tutional liberty and in conflict with the doctrine he had taught his countrymen throughout his life, may still bring their tribute of honor to his memory, as Whittier, who had written Ichabod brought his imperishable tribute of affection and honor, which, alas ! was never placed on the brow of Webster, but only laid on his grave.

I have been asked to speak of Mr. Webster as a Senator. He was, beyond doubt, the foremost of American Senators. When we think of the Senate Chamber, we think of him as its principal figure and ornament. Yet he did much less than many other men to influence the action of the Senate. In his time, the Senate, more than before or since, might have been described as a meeting of the Ambassadors of States. Its members met with minds made up and did not expect to convince one another. He spoke, as his successor said he did, "as from a pulpit with a lofty sounding-board," with the whole people for his congregation.

His place in history is that of a public teacher, guiding the thought and inspiring the emotions of his countrymen when the issues on which hung the fate of the republic were being determined. For this function he was fitted alike by his intellect and his heart. He was a great reasoner, a great orator, and a great lover. He had the qualities which belong to humanity, by which its hold, half on earth and half on heaven, is maintained.

Matthew Arnold said that our American public men lacked distinction. He allowed that quality to Grant, though he could not find it in Abraham Lincoln. If he did not find it in Webster, the cultured and fastidious

Englishman would probably have denied it to the Apollo Belvedere, or the Phidian Jove, or the great god Pan.

Why, the draymen in London turned to look after him in the streets! Sidney Smith said he was a steam engine in breeches. He moved to an unwonted admiration the bitter cynicism of Carlyle. If ever being walked the earth clad in the panoply of an imperial manhood, it was Daniel Webster. If ever being trod the earth of whom the Greek or Roman fable would have made a demi-god, it was this child of the New Hampshire farmhouse. Even when his foes would describe him, at the time when political hatred was most bitter, they had to borrow Milton's lofty imagery, as he pictures the fallen angels gathered in their awful Senate Chamber.

He was a great lover. Was there ever a man who loved his country, or who loved his college, or who loved his father and his brother and his children, and his neighbors and friends, who loved the old scenes over which his mother had led his boyish feet, or where he dwelt with his neighbors by mountain or shore, as Daniel Webster loved them?

There was never a child entered his presence that did not remember to his dying day the kindly and tender look that came from the deep eyes, and the winning and beautiful smile that lit up the melancholy of the grave face, no matter what care might be weighing upon the brow.

His sentences dwell and abide with us like the Psalms of David or the songs of Burns. Bright boys repeat them over and over to themselves. The fisherman on the boat thinks of them, and the sailor at the helm, and the farmer as he holds the plow. They come

up in the mind of the soldier as he goes into battle, and the patriot on his dying bed.

When New Hampshire, a little while ago, placed his statue in the Capitol, I had something to do with the transaction. Just afterward, I got two letters from brave soldiers of the Civil War. One of them says: "In the forlorn hope at Port Hudson, beaten back, we sought the refuge of the scraggy bushes, and then, on that cloudless afternoon, I saw the flag of our regiment, and his undying peroration returned to my mind. Who can say how much that speech shotted our guns?" The other told me that he was stationed one night on picket duty, where two sentinels in succession had just before been shot down. As he marched up and down in the loneliness of the night, thinking that at any time his death-shot might ring out from the thicket, he kept up his courage by repeating to himself, over and over and over again, the closing passage of the reply to Hayne, which he had got by heart in his boyhood.

The same thoughts have been uttered before and since by other orators. Other men have appealed to the same emotion. Other men have spoken to the same people, but only to meet the fate of him who tried to rival the inimitable thunderbolt and storm with sounding of brass and trampling of the feet of horses.

"Qui nimbus et non imitabile fulmen

Aere et cornipedum pulsu simularet equorum."

It is said that other countries are founded upon force; that in the end they rest upon the bayonet and the cannon. I am not sure that this theory will bear the light of careful consideration. But however that may be, the Republic is founded upon ideas. When

those ideas lose their power over the minds and hearts of the people, the Republic will come to an end. It is the fortune of Daniel Webster, as of no other man except Jefferson, that the great ideas which lie at the foundation of the Republic clothe themselves to every man's understanding in his language, and rest for their sanction and vindication upon his argument.

In general, our knowledge of history is like our memory of a journey in a foreign land. We remember vividly a few great pictures in great galleries. We think of a few landscapes, and, perhaps, the forms and faces of a few famous men. If we met them and talked with them, we remember what they said. Everything else is blurred and indistinct. So history is made up to us of a few memorable scenes, a few human figures, or a few sentences that have fallen from some great actor on a great occasion. We know our own history as well as any people on the face of the earth. Yet still what I have said is true of us. To every American, certainly to every son of New England, to blot out the figure of Daniel Webster from our history, from the day Washington died till the day Lincoln took the oath of office, would be like cutting out the figure of the Virgin Mary from Raphael's great painting at Dresden. How it mingles with every great event and in every historic spot! To the lover of constitutional liberty, there is nothing like the reply to Hayne since Pericles died, save only the dying speech of Chatham, and that of Patrick Henry at Williamsburg. There is nothing like it since, save Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg. We cannot think of the Senate Chamber without him. We cannot think of the Supreme Court without him. We cannot think

of Dartmouth College without him. We cannot think of Faneuil Hall without him. We cannot think of Boston, or Concord, or Lexington, or Bunker Hill, without him. We cannot think of New Hampshire without him. We cannot think of Massachusetts without him. We cannot think of America without him. We cannot think of the Constitution or of the Union without him. His figure naturally belongs to and mingles with all great scenes and great places which belong to liberty. Emerson said his presence would have been enough, even had he refrained from speech, when the monument at Bunker Hill was dedicated. There was the monument, and there was Webster.

There is no judgment of any court, save Marshall's, more weighty,—I am afraid there is none more likely to be of permanent authority,—than the recorded opinions of Webster on Constitutional Law. There is nothing in our forensic literature more likely to endure than his speeches.

He not only seemed to give a new nobility to what is noble and great, but he ennobled and made great the common scenes of common life with which he mingled. I venture to say that every man now living, or every man who ever did live, who saw Webster, if it were but as he passed in the street, remembered it freshly ever afterward, as an indelible memory of life. Whether it were in the schoolroom at Exeter, or the classroom at Dartmouth, or the quiet visit at some neighbor's home, or in some great natural scene, or some great public gathering by the seashore, or on the mountain, or in the college hall, or in the court room, or in the Senate Cham-

ber, he is still everywhere the foremost figure and is inseparably blended with the scene.

President Tucker : I am told that it is contrary to the traditions of the Supreme Court of the United States that the Chief-Justice should speak in any official or semi-official way on general public occasions. I beg the Chief-Justice of the United States, if hampered by the traditions of the Court, to remember that he is now in his ancestral home and that he is enjoying the privacy of the occasion.

Speech of Chief-Justice Melville Weston Fuller, LL. D.

Mr. President and Brethren :—

It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge the cordial welcome you have extended to me, but in accepting the kind invitation of your committee to be present at this commemoration I had no intention of delivering an address or making any extended remarks. I adhere in that respect to the general rule, which, as I understand it, has been observed by my illustrious predecessors, not meaning by the remark to include my associates on the bench. All will admit that the rule is an exceedingly salutary one to be observed at one o'clock at night. But some words I will add, in respect of certain special considerations, which have moved me to be with you. I say special considerations, for the desire to participate in this celebration needs no explanation.

As the president told you this morning, my father's father and my mother's father were both graduates of

Dartmouth, and both in College with Mr. Webster. Chief-Justice Weston graduated two years later. Henry W. Fuller was his classmate, or as Mr. Webster himself put it, his "brother student, brother collegemate brother classmate, brother Frater, brother Adelphian, and friend." Mr. Webster's letters to that classmate are heirlooms in the family and they amply illustrate the charming phase of Mr. Webster's character to which Dr. Hale has referred. In one of them he gives the process of reasoning by which the conclusion is reached that Daniel Webster is the handsomest man in New England. As I remember it, it ran something like this: That Boston was the handsomest town in New England; that Christopher Gore's office was the handsomest office in Boston; and that Daniel Webster was the handsomest man in Christopher Gore's office. Argal, that Daniel Webster was the handsomest man in New England. In another he writes that he has heard from Davis that everything is going on finely at Hanover, pumpkin pie and professors plenty; wheat and poetry a good deal blasted; girls and ginger-bread as sweet as ever; and in another he compares life to a contra-dance in which he thinks somehow he has "slipped a foot." You can readily understand the influence which such recollections, coupled with traditions of the relations between the two friends, naturally had upon me on receiving the invitation of your committee. But there was another and a weightier cause that impelled me, a sense of duty to testify by my personal attendance to the tie that binds the memory of this great minister of justice to the court, in aid of whose labors some of the most splendid manifestations of his intellectual power were exhibited. It

is impossible to overestimate the support that the court derives from the bar, and in Mr. Webster's arguments fidelity to the court is as conspicuous as fidelity to his client. It was not client first, and conscience afterwards, but duty to both together, one and inseparable. And this was so notwithstanding that on occasion he departed from the logical line of his contention to indulge in outbursts of wonderful and apparently spontaneous eloquence. I should like to go further and to dwell on the long line of cases in which Mr. Webster's work contributed so much to strengthen and solidify our institutions, and "to clear the foundations, strengthen the pillars, and raise the august dome of the Temple of Justice still higher in the skies." But I forbear in deference to the precedent to which I have alluded.

Nearly forty-nine years ago, an undergraduate on leave of absence for the purpose, I attended the funeral of Mr. Webster at Marshfield. The beauty of that October day; the majestic aspect of the great lawyer and advocate, statesman and orator, as he lay in his accustomed habiliments under the spreading branches of a beautiful tree in front of the mansion; and the walk of neighbors and friends, distinguished personages, and others, over the fields to the grave, are still vivid in my memory. As a youth I paid that tribute to Daniel Webster, an incident quite unimportant save to the boy himself. And I repeat it now after the lapse of nearly fifty years, with the added significance involved in the office I hold, whose incumbent if another than myself would have been fully justified, as I am, in bearing witness as such, to the immortality of a fame so connected

with the administration of justice, and with the vindication of liberty as the creature of law, that, to use his own language, it "is and must be as durable as the frame of human society."

President Tucker: Brethren, it remains for me only while you are standing on the eve of your going, to return the thanks of Dartmouth College to our distinguished guests who have honored us by their words and by their presence and to announce that the Webster Centennial is closed.

Effect of the Dartmouth College Case as a Precedent.*

By the Honorable Alfred Russell, LL. D., '50.

'T was charged, and doubtless firmly believed, by the statesmen and philosophers of the old world, that property would not be safe under a government like ours, derisively called by 'Thomas Carlyle "anarchy plus a street constable." But the College Case so construed and applied a provision of our Federal Constitution as to render vested rights, of a corporate character, more secure here than in Europe.

In the mother country, where the power of Parliament is not limited by a written constitution, that body has introduced into the universities, and other endowed charities, changes greater than the state sought to impose upon the college, and has deprived business corporations of their franchises as a matter of mere legislative discretion, as in the noteworthy case of the East India Company, in 1858, which governed millions of people.

By the original College charter from the king, granted in 1769, twelve persons therein named were in-

*The regret caused by the absence of Mr. Russell from the banquet and the loss of the speech which he would have made is in part compensated for by this article which is inserted by permission. The paper is of special value as presenting an aspect of the Dartmouth College Case not otherwise treated in the addresses or speeches of this volume.

corporated by the name of "The Trustees of Dartmouth College," and to them and their successors the usual corporate privileges and powers were granted, among which was authority to govern the College and fill all vacancies in their own body. By acts of the Legislature of New Hampshire, passed in 1816, the charter was amended, the number of trustees increased to twenty-one, the appointment of the additional members vested in the executive of the state, and a Board of Overseers, consisting of twenty-five persons, created, with power to inspect and control the most important acts of the trustees. The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of New Hampshire, and the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of Vermont, for the time being, were to be members "ex officio"; and the Board was to be completed by the Governor and Council of New Hampshire, who were also empowered to fill all vacancies which might occur. A majority of the trustees of the College refused to accept this amended charter, and brought suit for the corporate property, which was in the possession of a person holding by authority of the acts of the Legislature.

The Superior Court of Judicature of New Hampshire sustained the legislation of the State. Upon review by the Federal Supreme Court, it was said that the ingredients of a contract are parties, consent, consideration and obligation; that the case presented all these; that the parties were the king and the donees of the powers and privileges conferred; that consent was shown by what they did; that the considerations were the investments of moneys for the purpose of the foundation, the public benefits expected to accrue, and the

implied undertaking of the corporation faithfully to fulfill the duties with which it was charged ; that the obligation was to do the latter under the penalty of forfeiture for non-user or mis-user ; that on the part of the king there was an implied obligation that the life of the compact should be subject to no other contingency. The Court, therefore, declared the charter to possess all the elements of a contract, within the meaning of Article 1, Section 10, of the Constitution, ordaining that no state shall pass any law impairing the obligations of contracts. It was consequently ruled that the State laws changing the charter without the consent of the corporation were repugnant to the Federal Constitution, the supreme law of the land, binding the judges in every state, and the judgment of the State Court was reversed and annulled.

During the eighty years since this decision, made in 1819, the Federal Supreme Court has often said that the question decided in the College Case has been considered as finally settled in the jurisprudence of the entire country ; that murmurs of doubt and dissatisfaction are occasionally heard, but that there has been no re-argument in that Court and that none has ever been asked for. The Court has also said that the decision must be regarded as imbedded in the Constitution itself, and that it has been re-affirmed and applied so often as to have become established as a canon of American jurisprudence.

The adoption of the fourteenth amendment, in 1868, amounted to a solemn approval of the decision by the states themselves, and extended the guardianship

of the Federal Constitution over all other rights within the states, as well as contracts.

Many hundreds of subsequent cases in both Federal and State Courts have established the law, in conformity with the College Case, that wherever rights have been acquired by virtue of a corporate charter, such rights, so far as necessary to the complete enjoyment of the main object of the grant, are contracts and beyond the reach of legislation, unless the express power of amendment, alteration or repeal has been reserved by the state granting the charter.

The College Case has justly been regarded as a bulwark of private property, and the numerous decisions based upon it, setting aside acts of the state legislatures, have been of inestimable benefit. The astonishing inventions which have greatly increased the business of transportation and interstate commerce have been steadily adjudicated upon according to the principle of the College Case, and this course of adjudication has been largely the source of the success of the great enterprises which have so much benefited the country.

In the intervening time, important modifications of the Case have been made. Our system of judiciary law has the advantage that its elasticity enables those who administer it to adapt it to the varying conditions of the successive generations to whom it is immediately applied. The America of 1901 is very different from the America of 1819. The requirements and habits, wants, usages, and interests of the different stages of time elapsing since the decision have, indeed, led to modifications of the decision, but its principle is absolutely untouched, and always will be. Twenty years

after the decision it was determined in the Charles River Bridge Case that an exclusive right to enjoy a franchise can never be presumed, and that, unless the charter contains words of exclusion, it is no impairment of the grant, under the College Case, to permit another to do the same thing, although the value of the franchise to the first grantee may be wholly destroyed. Such is the law to-day. Forty years after the Bridge Case came the so-called Granger Cases, holding that all private property, corporate or not, which is affected with a public use, is subject to the affirmative right of the State Legislature to fix the charges for the use of such property; and this principle was applied to the western grain elevators and grain conveying railroads. These cases were the outgrowth of a widely diffused feeling of apprehension that the accumulation of wealth was too much protected by the principle of the College Case. Twenty years after the Granger Cases the College Case came again under review in the so-called Nebraska Case and kindred cases, establishing that there is implied in the franchise of a carrying corporation a grant of a contract right to collect such tolls as will enable the company to operate and return a profit to the investors, and that the reasonableness of rates of carriage, fixed by the Legislature under the Granger Cases, may be reviewed by the courts. These cases grew out of the portentous fact that the states, acting on the principle of the Granger Cases, were passing laws which were destroying the value of railroad property.

The Federal Supreme Court has had, perhaps, more frequent occasion to re-affirm the principle of the College Case in cases respecting the power of taxation

than in any other ; and, in a long series of decisions, has held that a provision in a charter imposing certain taxes in lieu of all other taxes or of all taxes, to which the company or stockholders therein would be subject, is impaired by legislation raising the rate of taxation, or imposing taxes other than those specified in the charter ; and this doctrine has been strictly adhered to up to the present time.

Within the same principle, derived from the College Case as limited by the Bridge Case, are grants of an exclusive right to supply gas, or water, to a municipality, or to occupy its streets for railway purposes.

So we see that the principles of the College Case, arising concerning the privileges of an ancient institution for the preservation of learning and religion, has not only been a shield and buckler for those transcendent interests of our country, but has been carried, in a most unforeseen way, into the domain of the vast business concerns of continental America. The wealth of our corporations equals in value four-fifths of the entire property of the country. They do business with the citizens of every state, and with foreign nations, and in their enormous transactions and litigations, it is the aegis of the College Case which is held over them, a sure protection.

It may be said, in conclusion, that the effect of the College Case as a precedent has been the creation of the whole body of American doctrine regarding vested rights, as applied to the charters of corporations. This doctrine was born of the College Case, and lives, moves, and has its being in it, and always will as long as our government endures. This case has been cited in sub-

sequent judicial opinions more times than any other case in the "American Reports," — about nine hundred and seventy times!

Letter from Daniel Webster to Horatio G. Cilley, Esquire.*

WASHINGTON, Sunday Evening,
February 25, 1838.

My Dear Sir :—

BEFORE this reaches you, you will probably have heard of the death of your Nephew, the Hon'ble Mr. Cilley, member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maine.

This melancholy event was the result of a Duel, fought yesterday afternoon, between him and the Hon'ble Mr. Graves, a member of the same House of Congress, from the State of Kentucky.

I have no authentic information of the circumstance which led to the contest, nor of those which accompanied it. The friends of the Parties will no doubt immediately lay before the public statements of such particulars as they may suppose friends may desire naturally to be informed of. The main object of this letter, is to express my commiseration with the numerous branches of your family, with whom I have been more or less acquainted, at this afflicting occurrence. Mr. Cilley himself I had not known much. He

*This letter was read at the meeting in the Old Chapel on Wednesday afternoon, and is referred to on page 188 of this volume. As it was received too late for publication in the body of the book, it is inserted here.

had so recently become a member of Congress, that our acquaintance was slight. I had heard him speak in his place, once or twice, however, and I thought he spoke with ability. But having known his father, and most of his uncles, either in public or private life, and having had some little acquaintance with his relatives, of his own generation, I have felt it a kind of duty to express toward them condolence, and commiseration, and I ask you to communicate these sentiments, as you may meet with the members of the family, whom I know.

The members of the Delegation from Maine, in both Houses, all of whom are deeply affected by the event, will do all that remains to be done. The funeral will probably be attended to-morrow. How melancholy it is, My Dear Sir, that neither law nor religion, nor both, can check the prevalence, in society, of the practice of private combat!

With friendly regard,

Yours,

DANL. WEBSTER.

Horatio G. Cilley, Esq.,

Deerfield,

N. Hamp.

HIS book was designed, put into type and printed
for Dartmouth College, at the Dartmouth Press,
Hanover, New Hampshire, MCMII ❖ ❖ ❖ ❖ ❖

H104 80



SHAW FOUNDRESS



0 009 931 781 4